

# Monastic Turmoil in Sixth-Century Jerusalem and the South Caucasus

## *The Letter of Patriarch John IV to Catholicos Abas of the Caucasian Albanians*

ABRAHAM TERIAN

The letter (henceforth, Letter) under consideration illustrates the turmoil in sixth-century Jerusalem as well as the unease in the churches of the South Caucasus because of the Council of Chalcedon (451 CE). It constitutes another primary source adding to our information hitherto dependent almost entirely on Cyril of Scythopolis (d. 558) and his evidence for the lives of the monks in the Judean desert.<sup>1</sup> As for the situation in the Caucasus, it complements what can be gathered from the Armenian epistolary *Girk' T'it'oc'* (Book of Letters), first edited during the catholicosate of Komitas of Alck' (in office 615–628) and subsequently arranged by the Cilician sage T'ovma of Hromklay in 1298.<sup>2</sup> This overlooked Letter reveals the continued confessional and liturgical influence the

Church of Jerusalem exerted on the Eastern churches. What is more, employing the historical influence of the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, John IV (in office 575–594) attempts to draw Abas, the catholicos of Caucasian Albania (in office 552–596),<sup>3</sup> into accepting the dyophysite christology defined at Chalcedon. The patriarch urges Abas to sever the confessional ties with the neighboring Armenian Church and to purge his monasteries of Armenian “heretics”—just as he himself had succeeded in purging the monasteries within his jurisdiction of their non-Chalcedonian Armenians.

Abas is the recipient also of an earlier letter found in the *Book of Letters* (translated below as Addendum), from Catholicos Yovhannēs II Gabelean of Armenia (in office 557–574), which alerts him of Nestorian/Chalcedonian infiltrations into the monastic establishments within his jurisdiction, reminds him of the credo-confessional tradition in which he stands,

1 On adversities between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians during this turbulent period in Jerusalem and the surrounding monasteries, see J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 1994), 1–17, 183–201; cf. J. Patrich, “Church, State and the Transformation of Palestine in the Byzantine Period (324–638 C.E.),” in *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*, ed. T. E. Levy (London, 1995), 470–87. For the period when non-Chalcedonians, including Origenists, held sway especially in the monasteries of southern Palestine, see C. B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2006).

2 Y. Izmireanc', ed., *Girk' T'it'oc'* (Book of Letters), Sahak Mesropean Matenadaran 5 (Tiflis, 1901; rev. ed. by N. Polarian [Bogharian] [Jerusalem, 1994]). For an in-depth study of the christological issues contained in the epistolary, see L. Frivold, *The Incarnation: A Study of the*

*Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Armenian Church in the 5th and 6th Centuries according to the Book of Letters* (Oslo, 1981).

3 John's years in office are based on Evagrius Scholasticus, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.16; trans. M. Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, TTH 33 (Liverpool, 2000), 277 and n. 59. Abas's years in office are based on a seventh/tenth-century history: Movsēs Kalankatuac'i, *Patmut' iwn Aluanic' Ašxarbi*, ed. V. A'ak'elyan (Erevan, 1983), 118–19, 342–43; trans. C. J. F. Dowsett, *The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranc'i*, London Oriental Series 8 (London, 1961), 70 and n. 3, 228–29 (2.4; 3.23[24]). Regardless of the varying authorial attribution(s), the work is rightly considered anonymous.

and urges him to chase out the intruders.<sup>4</sup> That letter, addressed equally “to the bishops of the Caucasian Albanians” in ca. 570 and marking the renewal of anti-Nestorian/anti-Chalcedonian hostilities in the region, must have resulted in a kind of religious persecution—reminiscent of “pagan” times—of which the patriarch of Jerusalem was made aware and which seems to have compelled him to write to Abas (§18). More than reflecting the conditions in the South Caucasus, however, his Letter reflects the rippling but strong effects of the ongoing Chalcedonian controversy in Jerusalem. John IV writes when new in office, in 575, as he indicates in the Letter opening, only a year after the death of the Armenian catholicos.

The patriarch of Jerusalem was urged by a certain T’umas, the courier monk of Caucasian-Albanian origin and resident of the Monastery of Pant (on the east side of the Mount of Olives),<sup>5</sup> to write the Letter (§§1, 16). We learn from the seventh/tenth-century *History of the Caucasian Albanians* that this “hypocrite T’omas” was the foremost proponent of dyophysitism in his native country, and that he was chased out with others, unnamed and named (Elia, Bnot, and Ibas), during the purges undertaken by Abas.<sup>6</sup> Among the major factors compelling the patriarch to comply with the request were two polemical documents received from T’umas, issued by an Armenian Church council held in Dwin—undoubtedly the second council held there,<sup>7</sup> convened

in 554/5 by Catholicos Nersēs II Bagrewandac’i (in office 548–557). The council, which coincides with non-Chalcedonian responses to hostile Chalcedonian takeovers of monasteries and bishoprics in various parts of the empire, including Syria and Palestine,<sup>8</sup> endorsed a new calendar to mark the “Armenian Era” as of 551 CE—a blatant split from the Byzantine and Sasanian hegemones fighting over Armenia—considered canonical reforms, and ratified the non-Chalcedonian stance of the Armenian Church by anathematizing first the Nestorians and then the Chalcedonians.<sup>9</sup> Not long after the council, Nersēs II was succeeded by Yovhannēs II, who earlier as bishop of Apahunik’ had been an active delegate at Dwin. He had defended the anti-Nestorian/anti-Chalcedonian position of his Church, convinced that the Nestorians—Theodoret of Cyrrihus in particular—were the architects of the Council of Chalcedon aimed at countering the consensus attained at the Council of Ephesus in 431. Politically, too, these were hard times for the Armenians, who were prompted to rebel against the Zoroastrian Sasanians in 572, thus causing the outbreak of the Byzantine–Sasanian war that lasted till 591,<sup>10</sup> ending with Byzantine control over most of Armenia. At the start of the war, with the cathedral church of St. Gregory in Dwin destroyed, the catholicos and a faction of the Armenian nobility—the Mamikoneans in particular—took refuge in Constantinople, where they were obliged to accept the christology of Chalcedon and where the catholicos

4 Text in Polarian, *Girk’ T’H’oc’*, 210–14; quoted in full by Kalankatuac’i, *History of the Caucasian Albanians* 2.7 (trans. Dowsett, 72–74). For a French translation of the letter, see N. G. Garsoïan, *L’église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, CSCO 574, Subsidia 100 (Leuven, 1999), 486–90; and 248, on the date “avant 572.”

5 On the name and the site of the monastery, see n. 38.

6 Kalankatuac’i, *History of the Caucasian Albanians* 2.8 (trans. Dowsett, 74–75), cited by Garsoïan, *L’église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, 292–93 and n. 30. As noted by her, the identity connection was first made by S. P. Cowe, “An Armenian Job Fragment from Sinai and Its Interpretation,” *OC* 76 (1992): 125–57, at 139. On the tenth-century continuator of the *History*, see J. Howard-Johnston, “Caucasian Albania and Its Historian,” in *From Albania to Arrān: The East Caucasus between the Ancient and Islamic Worlds* (ca. 330 BCE–1000 CE), ed. R. G. Hoyland, Gorgias Studies in Classical and Late Antiquity 25 (Piscataway, NJ, 2020), 351–69.

7 On the plurality of assemblies at Dwin 2, see the anonymous Armenian-Chalcedonian *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, an eighth-century polemical work that survives in Greek translation; ed. G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae: Édition critique et commentaire*, CSCO 132, Subsidia 4 (Leuven, 1952), §§68–76. For its parallel Georgian text with translation, see Z. Aleksidzé and J.-P. Mahé,

“Arsen Sapareli, *Sur la séparation des Géorgiens et des Arméniens*,” *REArm* 32 (2010): 59–132, esp. 79. The first phase of Dwin 2 need not be confused with the First Council of Dwin, convened in 505/6 by Catholicos Babgēn I Or’msec’i (in office 490–516 or 502–507), which denounced the Nestorians—especially Barsumas, bishop of Nisibis—examined the *Henōtikon* issued by Emperor Zeno in 482, and rejected the christology defined at Chalcedon.

8 See V. A. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (New York, 2008), 12–57, 106–34.

9 The documents in question are extant as part of Polarian, *Girk’ T’H’oc’*, 196–203; French trans. in Garsoïan, *L’église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, 474–81. For the thirty-seven canons of Dwin II, see *Kanonagirk’ Hayoc’* (Canon Law of the Armenians), ed. V. Hakobyan, 2 vols. (Erevan, 1964–71), 1:475–90, 638–40.

10 On the earliest Armenian account of the war, see *The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos*, trans. R. W. Thomson, comm. J. Howard-Johnston, assist. T. Greenwood, 2 pts., TTH 31 (Liverpool, 1999), 1:6–12 and notes.

died in 574, leaving the denunciation of the agreement reached in Constantinople for his successors.<sup>11</sup>

Of special interest are the two letters of Constantinopolitan origin quoted in the Letter: one by the unnamed emperor (none other than Justin II, r. 565–578), who refers to Armenian princely mediators on behalf of the monks expelled from Jerusalem and whom he denounces as heretics (§3); the other by the unnamed patriarch of the imperial city (none other than John III Scholasticus, in office 565–577), who boasts of having compelled the Armenian churchmen and nobility who had taken refuge there—those “obvious heretics”—to adhere to Chalcedon. He achieved this by denying them residency until they were “in communion.” The hard line taken by the patriarch is in keeping with his known severity against Miaphysites, more so after Justin’s accession to the throne.<sup>12</sup> The “princes” or tribal chiefs, the feudal lords of the autonomous principalities or satrapies known as *naxarark’* in Armenian, were often seen as royal scions at home and abroad.<sup>13</sup> They were on hand to be “summoned” by the ecumenical patriarch (§§4–6a).

Equally noteworthy are the author’s remarks about Armenian monasteries in Jerusalem. These remarks corroborate another Armenian document from this period, dated to the middle of the sixth century and twice redacted since: the list of Armenian monasteries in and around Jerusalem, by Anastas Vardapet, a document long known in scholarship.<sup>14</sup> It identifies

a monastery, that of the Tašrac’ik’ (“those from [the region of] Tašir”) as being built by the Arsacids,<sup>15</sup> and another in the center of the city, the “monastery of the Araweneans” (who hail from Ayarat)<sup>16</sup> “in the middle of the marketplace,” in conjunction with others said to have been built in the city by the Mamikoneans.<sup>17</sup> The plurality of Armenian monasteries in Jerusalem, for which there is substantial archaeological evidence,<sup>18</sup> is further acknowledged here, when referring to “one of them” (a partitive genitive) being set on fire (§3).

Of no less interest is the patriarch’s understanding of the causes of the Armenian opposition to Chalcedon, which he attributes to misleading Syrian influence, especially by Abdisho of Sareba (§§2, 12), who figures prominently in the christological controversies of the period and was a key figure in attendance at the Second Council of Dwin.<sup>19</sup> However, the patriarch seems to

arméniens de Jérusalem à la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, TM 14 (Paris, 2002), 257–67; repr. in eadem, *Studies on the Formation of Christian Armenia*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Farnham, 2010), VIII. On its repeated redactions, see A. Terian, “Rereading the Sixth-Century List of Jerusalem Monasteries by Anastas Vardapet,” in *Sion: Mère des églises. Mélanges liturgiques offerts au Père Charles Athanase Renoux*, ed. M. D. Findikyan, D. Galadza, and A. Lossky, *Semaines d’études liturgiques Saint-Serge* 1 (Münster, 2016), 273–88.

15 The Armenian Arsacid dynasty came to an end with the deposition of its last monarch, Artasēs or Artasir III/IV, by the Sasanians in 428 (the ante-Chalcedonian date is noteworthy, unless descendants of the Arsacids are meant—as is most likely).

16 The Araweneans together with the Zarehawaneans, both from the Haykid line of the Orontids, “last appear in history in the seventh century”; C. Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, DC, 1963), 199.

17 Rulers of Tarōn or Taraunitis, west of Lake Van. They held the hereditary command of the Armenian army under the Arsacids and thereafter.

18 For some of the later discoveries, see M. E. Stone, “The New Armenian Inscriptions from Jerusalem,” in *Armenian Perspectives: 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association internationale des études arméniennes*, ed. N. Awde (Richmond, Surrey, 1997), 263–68; M. E. Stone et al., “A New Armenian Inscription from a Byzantine Monastery on Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem,” *IEJ* 61 (2011): 230–35; D. Amit and S. R. Wolff, “An Armenian Monastery in the Morasha Neighbourhood,” in *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed*, ed. H. Geva (Jerusalem, 1994), 293–98. For a general survey, see Y. Tchekhanovets, *The Caucasian Archaeology of the Holy Land: Armenian, Georgian and Albanian Communities between the Fourth and Eleventh Centuries CE*, *Handbook of Oriental Studies* 1: The Near and Middle East 123 (Leiden, 2018).

19 As attested in Polarian, *Girk’ T’H’oc’*, 172–95, where we learn of Abdisho’s long relation with the Armenian Church, going back

11 Garsoïan, *L’église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, 283–304; Krzysztof Stopka, *Armenia Christiana: Armenian Religious Identity and the Churches of Constantinople and Rome (4th–15th Century)*, trans. T. Bałuk Ulewiczowa, *Jagiellonian Studies in History* 8 (Krakow: Jagiellonian University Press, 2017), 77–81.

12 Though known for his works (*Sermo catecheticus*, *Synagoga L titulorum*, and *Collectio 87 capitulorum*), nothing survives of his letters and decrees.

13 On their role, see N. G. Garsoïan, trans., *The Epic Histories Attributed to P’awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk’)*, *Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies* 8 (Cambridge, MA, 1989), 549 and the references there, especially to N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions Based on the Naxarar System*, trans. and rev. N. G. Garsoïan (Lisbon, 1970), 191–200. Cf. Procopius’s description of the Armenian satraps appointed by Justinian I (*Buildings* 3.1.16–23).

14 On this maligned document, edited by A. K. Sanjian (“Anastas Vardapet’s List of Armenian Monasteries in Jerusalem: A Critical Examination,” *Le Muséon* 82 [1969]: 265–92), who called its authenticity into question, see N. G. Garsoïan’s points to the contrary, in eadem, “Le témoignage d’Anastas vardapet sur les monastères

be unaware of the compounded nature of the conflict in the Caucasus, where the controversy was not only christological but also increasingly ecclesiastical. The Pseudo-Dionysian corpus of writings, *Heavenly Hierarchy*, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, which appeared at the turn of the sixth century,<sup>20</sup> had by this time given rise to rivalry for additional ecclesiastical patriarchates to correspond with the nine heavenly hierarchies. Old loyalties to the Armenian Church—or the latter's claim to them—were being challenged by the hierarchs of Siwnik' and Iberia/Georgia, and possibly also by Abas himself.<sup>21</sup> It is important to note that in the letter to Abas and the Caucasian-Albanian bishops from Catholicos Yovhannēs II and the bishops with him (see

to the catholicosate of Babgēn at the turn of the century. His name appears also among the signatories of the letter by Catholicos Yovhannēs II and the Armenian bishops to Abas and the rest of the Caucasian Albanian bishops (Addendum, §1). His involvement at the Second Council of Dvin was extensive, having brought with him the *Refutation of Chalcedon* by Timothy Aelurus and certain works of Philoxenus of Mabbug; cf. Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, 457–73. See also T. Hainthaler, "Wer ist Abdisho? Einige Bemerkungen zum Einfluss syrischer Theologen in Armenien im 6. Jahrhundert," in *Geschichte, Theologie und Kultur des syrischen Christentums: Beiträge zum 7. Deutschen Syrologie-Symposium in Göttingen, Dezember 2011*, ed. M. Tamcke and S. Grebenstein, Göttinger Orientforschungen: Syriaca 46 (Wiesbaden, 2014), 81–91.

20 Pseudo-Dionysius: *The Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid and P. Rorem, The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York, 1987); crit. ed. R. W. Thomson, *The Armenian Version of the Works Attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite*, CSCO 488–489, Subsidia 17–18 (Leuven, 1987). Although this work was translated into Armenian early in the eighth century by Step'anos Siwnec'i, maintaining the Greek syntax, the Greek text was accessible to Armenian authors of the sixth century. Moreover, there possibly was an earlier translation done in Jerusalem, now lost, of at least a hagiography of the pseudonymous author, this according to an often copied colophon that reads: "This history of St. Dionysius was translated in the holy city Jerusalem from Greek, and the physician Hohannēs translated [it] into ours; 328 of the Armenian era [879/80 CE], to the glory of Christ our God, to whom be glory always"; Jerusalem, St. James, manuscript J282, as in N. Polarian, ed., *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*, 11 vols. (Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1966–91) 2:99; Այս պատմութիւն սրբոյն Դիոնիսիոսի ի Սր. քաղաքն Ես.ի թարգմանեալ էր ի յունականէն, իսկ ի մերս թարգմանեաց Յովհաննէս բժիշկ, ՅԻԸ, ի թուականութեանս հայոց ի փառս Քի. Այ. մերոյ ռ(ւ)րում փառք յաւ.; cf. 1:30, 303, 458; 2:276 for the text in manuscripts J1C, J97, J154D, J368. On earlier translational work there, I agree with the assessment by M. E. Stone that "it can be safely assumed that in fact such activity antedates these ninth-century references" (idem, "The Manuscript Library of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem," *IEJ* 19 [1969]: 20–43, at 27).

21 For analyses of the primary sources and the multiangular nature of the conflict, see the references provided in n. 67.

the Addendum below), Abas is not addressed as catholicos but simply as bishop of Partaw, the first among the addressed bishops, thus underscoring the hierarchical authority of the Armenian catholicos (a major factor in the eventual separation of the Iberian/Georgian Church from the Armenian Church at the turn of the seventh century). Equally noteworthy is the absence among the signatories of the bishop of Siwnik', the foremost episcopacy in Greater Armenia and aspiring then for autocephaly. The situation was further aggravated by the outbreak of the Byzantine–Sasanian War. It is unlikely that the patriarch wanted to exploit these adverse conditions to win Abas over; his main concern seems to have been confessional, as christology continued to be the single most pressing issue throughout this period.

The creedal statements contained in the Letter are significant. The one in §9, in two parts, if not a summary of the author's own confession of faith, suggests an outline of the Hierosolymitan creed in vogue at the time, somewhat primitive in form yet distinct from the baptismal creed in Cyril of Jerusalem's (d. 386) *Catecheses* (a Greek retroversion is provided with the translation). Of no less interest is the Chalcedonian creed quoted in §12, the Greek version of which is provided in the annotation, showing substantially faithful transmission of our document. Akin to these creedal passages is the author's brief commentary on the *trisagion* hymn (§§14, 17) and its perceived misunderstanding by non-Chalcedonians. The Chalcedonian view is that the hymn is addressed to the Trinity and not just to Christ, as understood by non-Chalcedonians accused of having added theologically conflicting words to the hymn.<sup>22</sup>

What the Letter reveals about conditions in Jerusalem during this period is commensurate with other historical accounts, as told three decades earlier by John of Ephesus and others.<sup>23</sup> However, the Letter reveals

22 It is of interest to point out that the letter from Yovhannēs II to Abas and the bishops under him similarly contains a non-Chalcedonian creed and makes reference to the *trisagion* with affirmation of the added phrase "who were crucified for our sake" (Addendum, §§4–3).

23 John of Ephesus, the Syrian non-Chalcedonian monk appointed missionary to the pagan regions of Asia Minor by Justinian I (r. 527–565), who zealously and with imperial backing championed the spread of monasticism since 540/2—while propagating miaphysitism. As a historian of the saints, John had been to Palestine in 534 and was well acquainted with its monasticism and the troubles there over Chalcedon, culminating with the expulsion of the non-Chalcedonian monks, who then congregated around ascetic



the height of the tension gripping the city at that time, even as it sheds some light on monastic contacts between Jerusalem and the South Caucasus, contacts that preceded the patriarch's time in office. Though he refers to such contacts in the recent past, during the patriarchates of his immediate predecessors whom he names (§2), ecclesial contacts between Jerusalem and the Caucasus have an older history.<sup>24</sup> Armenian tradition upholds the *Lectionary* as having been received on the authority of St. James, "the brother of the Lord" and first bishop of Jerusalem, and promoted with other apostolic traditions by his fourth-century heir, Cyril of Jerusalem. This tradition was transmitted with near-canonical sacredness, in keeping with the Isaianic saying about the going forth of the Word of the Lord "from Jerusalem" (Isaiah 2:3). Works originating from Jerusalem thus became key sources when rebutting the observance of feast days conflicting with the received tradition, as also when engaging in christological controversies. Robert Thomson rightly observes, "By far the most frequent references to Jerusalem as the source of orthodoxy come in the correspondence exchanged between Armenian and Georgian bishops at the beginning of the seventh century."<sup>25</sup>

Expulsions of non-Chalcedonians from "Orthodox" monasteries were not limited to the Holy Land; they were carried out in various parts of the empire and helped add to the monastic institutions in the South Caucasus. John of Ephesus speaks of a certain Thomas, an Armenian and son of a satrap, who

founded a non-Chalcedonian monastery in Byzantine Armenia around 514, with some eight hundred followers from among the locals, including priests and a chorepiscopus.<sup>26</sup> But this was not a lasting settlement, for John goes on to tell about Chalcedonian resistance instigated by the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem of Amida (in office 526–546), following the synod of Constantinople in 537, that compelled the satrap to ask Thomas to leave the district lest there be bloodshed.<sup>27</sup>

Even though the patriarch of Jerusalem acknowledges that he was compelled to write because of the urging by T'umas, who made him aware of the inimical Armenian Church council (§2), the ultimate purpose for writing is made transparently clear in the last paragraph, just before the closing lines—to have Abas end the animosity directed against Chalcedonians within his jurisdiction, if only the latter could be won over theologically. The polemics of the period were too vehement and the hostility too deep to have made the author more diplomatic in his approach and the recipient more tolerant, the epistolary niceties notwithstanding. Through it all, the patriarch emerges as a zealous *didaskalos*.

Comments on other points of interest in the Letter are relegated to the translation notes.

communities in southern Palestine; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, 3 vols., *PO* 17:1–307, 18:513–698, 19:151–285 (Paris, 1923–26). On the zealous acts of John of Ephesus, see S. A. Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and the Lives of the Eastern Saints*, *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 18 (Berkeley, 1990), passim, esp. 13–21, 43–56, 94–107. For more, see J. J. van Ginkel, "John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium" (PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1995).

24 See A. Terian, *Macarius of Jerusalem: Letter to the Armenians*, *AD* 335, *AVANT: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition* 4 (Crestwood, NY, 2000), including the appendices on festal issues, pp. 141–62; also A. Plontke-Lüning, "Jerusalem in the Caucasus: Church Building and Relic Traditions in Late Antiquity," in *From Albania to Arrān* (see n. 6), 233–51.

25 R. W. Thomson, "Jerusalem and Armenia," in *Studia Patristica: Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1983*, vol. 18.1: *Historica, Theologica, Gnostica, Biblica*, ed. E. A. Livingstone (Kalamazoo, MI, 1985), 77–91, at 83; repr. in idem, *Studies in Armenian Literature and Christianity* (Altershot, UK, 1994), ch. V. For a translation of some of this correspondence, see Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, 516–83.

26 On Thomas and his education, see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, §21 (*PO* 17:283–98). Cf. B. Flusin, "Palestinian Hagiography and the Reception of the Council of Chalcedon," in *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Greek*, ed. S. F. Johnson, *The Worlds of Eastern Christianity*, 300–1500 6 (Farnham, 2015; New York, 2016), 261–80; translation of Flusin, "L'hagiographie palestinienne et la réception du concile de Chalcedoine," in *Leimôn: Studies Presented to Lennart Rydén on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. O. Rosenqvist, *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 6 (Uppsala, 1996), 25–47. See also Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, 130–31.

27 In his review of M. Tarchnišvili and J. Assfalg, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur, auf Grund des ersten Bandes der georgischen Literaturgeschichte von K. Kekelidze*, *ST* 185 (Vatican, 1955), D. M. Lang remarks: "Father Tarchnišvili thinks (pp. 61, 107–9, 412) that the Syrian Fathers, who are supposed to have brought monastic institutions to Georgia in the sixth century, were orthodox Chalcedonians; the reviewer is inclined to think of them as Monophysite refugees from Byzantine persecution, however unpalatable this view may be to the staunch protagonists of Georgian Orthodoxy and doctrinal purity"; *BSOAS* 19, no. 1 (1957): 179–81, at 181. Following the death of Zeno and the abrogation of the *Henoticon* by Justin I in 518, non-Chalcedonians who were exiled or who had fled from imperial lands took refuge in eastern territories, more so after the death of their protectress Theodora in 548.

## Text and Translation

The text of the Letter, published in 1896 by K. Tēr-Mkrtčean in a rare periodical,<sup>28</sup> is extant in a single Armenian manuscript now kept at the Matenadaran in Erevan: M500, fols. 428r–435v, dated 1305.<sup>29</sup> The manuscript, consisting of 448 folia, is a rich Cilician miscellany containing nearly all the historical documents pertaining to the Armenian Church's quests for church unity, first with Byzantium and then with Rome.<sup>30</sup> The contents have all the markings of a special, made-to-order compilation. The first half, arranged chronologically, is comprised of the entire correspondence and encyclicals of the ecumenist catholicos Nersēs IV Klayec'i, also known as Šnorhali, the "Graceful" (in office 1166–1173; fols. 4r–148v), followed by those of his successor, a nephew, Grigor IV Tlay (in office 1173–1193; fols. 148v–218r), and a letter by Nersēs of Lambron, a grandnephew and archbishop of Tarsus (d. 1198), addressed to the Rubenid baron Levon II (ca. 1195; fols. 218v–239v).<sup>31</sup> Documents of the second half, arranged rather haphazardly, revert to earlier contacts

with the Byzantines, beginning oddly with the letter from Photius I (in office 858–867) to Catholicos Zak'aria Jagec'i (in office 854–876; fols. 240r–272r) and culminating with an earlier doctrinal letter to the Armenians from Germanus I (in office 715–730; fols. 435v–445r). The latter was sent with Step'anos Siwnec'i at the end of his long sojourn in the Byzantine capital (712–28; d. 735, the year he became bishop of Siwnik'), where he translated numerous works from Greek—including the Pseudo-Dionysian corpus—and dialogued with the patriarch.<sup>32</sup> The Letter of John IV of Jerusalem to Catholicos Abas of Caucasian Albania is found just before this last document, preceded in turn by a number of papal documents: from the *Tome* of Pope Leo I (in office 440–461) on the two natures of Christ, adopted by the Council of Chalcedon, to later papal letters to Armenian hierarchs and their responses (fols. 354v–427v).<sup>33</sup>

The manuscript was copied by the scribe Vardan for the Chalcedonian catholicos Grigor VII Anawarzec'i

28 "Erusalēmi Yovhannēs episkoposi t'ult'ē" [The Letter of John Bishop of Jerusalem], *Ararat* 29 (1896): 252–56, intro. 214–15, indicating Ējmiacin MS 517 as his base and promising a detailed description of the manuscript at a later time (presently identified with Matenadaran MS 500). Latin translation by A. Vardanian, "Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief an den albanischen Katholikos Abas," *OC* 2 (1912): 64–77; French translation by Garsoïan, *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, 490–501.

29 Described in *Mayr c'uc'ak hayerēn jeñagrac' Maštoc' i anvan matenadarani* [General Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts of the Maštoc' Matenadaran], ed. Ö. Eganyan et al., ongoing series (Erevan, 1984–), 2:1009–18.

30 For a history of these quests for church unity, see I. Dorfmann-Lazarev, *Arméniens et Byzantins à l'époque de Photius: Deux débats théologiques après le triomphe d'orthodoxie*, CSCO 609, Subsidia 117 (Leuven, 2004); I. Augé, *Églises en dialogue: Arméniens et Byzantins dans la seconde moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, CSCO 633, Subsidia 124 (Leuven, 2011); P. Halfter, *Das Pappstum und die Armenier im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: Von den ersten Kontakten bis zur Fixierung der Kirchenunion im Jahre 1198*, Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, Beihefte zu J.-F. Böhmer, regesta imperii 15 (Cologne, 1996); idem, "L'église arménienne entre la papauté et les Byzantins aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles," in *L'église arménienne entre grecs et latins: Fin XI<sup>e</sup>–milieu XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Actes du colloque de Montpellier, 12 et 13 juin 2007*, ed. I. Augé and G. Dédéyan (Paris, 2009), 63–78; and J. Richard, *La papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Âge (XIII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, 3rd ed. (Rome, 2019), 200–205.

31 On this and another document by Nersēs of Lambron, see n. 33.

32 Text in Polarian, *Girk' T'lt'oc'*, 413–34; the response by Step'anos following, 435–66.

33 The papal letters are those of Pope Clement III (in office 1187–1191), written in 1189 and addressed to Catholicos Grigor Tlay and the Rubenid baron Levon II (fols. 374r–376r), requesting their help for the Crusaders; and of Pope Innocent III (in office 1198–1216), addressed to Catholicos Grigor VI Apirat (in office 1194–1203; fols. 377r–380v), to follow up on papal demands that led to the signing of the "Act of Union" in 1198. In Pope Clement's request Levon saw an opportunity to obtain a crown and become the first Armenian king of Cilicia. The crown was promised on condition of uniting the Armenian Church with Rome. Baron Levon II became Levon I the Magnificent (r. 1199–1219), and the church was Latinized to a certain extent. The manuscript contains two documents by Nersēs of Lambron: a letter to Baron Levon II on the perils of his ambition (fols. 218v–239v), and an address given at the Armenian Church Council of Tarsus in 1196 (fols. 381r–421r), convened to deal with the papal demands (fols. 421r–427v). Sandwiched between the letter of Photius and the papal letters are a number of short, mostly Armenian texts: a list of Armenian Church councils and canons emerging from those of Dwin; testimonies on the Bagratid marzpan Smbat IV (d. 617), famed for clashing with Emperor Maurice after the partition of Armenia in 591; Cyril of Alexandria's Second Letter to Succensus (*Ep.* 46); a recapitulation of the Armenian Church councils by Catholicos Yovhannēs Ōjneg'i (in office 717–728); correspondence between the abovementioned Catholicos Grigor IV Tlay and the "Eastern" opponents to union with Rome; a ninth-century letter translated from Greek (in 1203), from Archbishop John of Nicaea to the abovementioned Catholicos Zak'aria, on the feast of the Nativity and Theophany; and the Eutychian dogma that Christ had only one nature, with some christological terminology defined in context—with quotes mostly from works by Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria (fols. 273r–354v).

(in office 1293–1307), who in turn gifted it to the savant Esayi Nč'ec'i (d. 1338), the abbot of Glajor in eastern Armenia, where the monastic establishments showed strong and lasting opposition to the rapprochement with Rome. A colophon by the catholicos names Archbishop Kostandin of Caesarea in Cappadocia (none other than the successor catholicos Kostandin III, in office 1307–1322) as the bearer of the gift to the “Easterners” (fol. 320v), sent obviously with the intent of rallying their support for union with Rome. All this was happening at a time when the Crusader states were disintegrating and the kings of Armenian Cilicia, having embraced Catholicism, were seeking help from the Latin West. Grigor VII was appointed to the catholicosal office by King Het'um II (reigned intermittently, 1289–1307, having become a Franciscan monk resigned to a monastery in Mamistra), to finalize the union with Rome.<sup>34</sup>

The Greek Letter in Armenian translation and with overly polemical attitude toward miaphysitism could have survived not only in pro-Chalcedonian Armenian circles in Byzantine Armenia, but also in the Armenian catholicosal archive with numerous other letters, such as those included rather selectively in the *Book of Letters*. The history of the manuscript as a whole, provided above, offers some historical context for the preservation of the Letter apparently cherished by a Chalcedonian catholicos.

The text provided here follows the reading of manuscript M500, against which I have collated the text published by Tēr-Mkrtč'ean. The section divisions and their enumeration are those of Vardanian's Latin translation. I have added some capitalization and punctuation—including quotation marks, and have spelled

out common abbreviations found in manuscripts. I have retained the scribe's tendencies: his interchangeable use of *-aw* and *-o* (e.g., *cnawt* and *cnōt* within close proximity in §9), *-b* and *-p* (e.g., *ambarštut' iwn* in §§1, 3, and twice *amparštut' iwn* in §10), and more often than not, his genitive of nouns ending in *-i* as *-oy* instead of *-woy*, and his imperative ending *-eay* instead of *-ea*, but have eliminated the *shewa* (𐎱) regularly added to consonantal syllables in divided words. The scribal inconsistencies reveal certain of the old characteristics of the text that have survived in the course of its transmission.

The characteristics of a translated text are too numerous to mention. Among the dominant features are syntactical disarrangements, unexpected synonyms, and varying morphs of words within close proximity (e.g., *ančariapēs* and *ančariabar* in §9).

The integrity of the text is unquestionable, except for some slight ambiguity in §§3–6 surrounding the two epistolary quotations: one from a letter the author received from the emperor, and another from a letter he received from the ecumenical patriarch, who also refers to a letter he received from the emperor and from which he quotes. It is possible that these quotations with their secondary quotes could have confused an early scribe, if not the translator of the Greek text. Possible conflation is to be suspected in the absence of demarcation between quoted and unquoted lines in these knotted sections. Vardanian's section divisions here are reflective of the ambiguity (I have overlooked his divisions while maintaining his enumeration).<sup>35</sup> My reading of the text at this juncture and throughout is made as plain as possible, in as literal a translation as possible.

34 C. Mutaſian, “Héthoum II, roi franciscaine d'Arménie (1289–1307),” in *Byzance et ses périphéries: Hommage à Alain Ducellier*, ed. A. Ducellier, B. Doumerc, and C. Picard, Collection “Méridiennes” (Toulouse, 2004), 263–82; cf. idem, “Entre le trône et le couvent: Héthoum II roi d'Arménie (1289–1307),” in Augé and Dédéyan, *L'église arménienne entre Grecs et Latins*, 169–82.

35 Garsoïan has this remark on the two quotations: “La fin de la lettre du patriarche et le début de celle de l'empereur manquent” (eadem, “Le témoignage d'Anastas vardapet sur les monastères arméniens,” 264 and n. 37).

## The Letter

*Այս Թուղթ Յոհաննոս<sup>a</sup> Երուսաղէմի Եպիսկոպոսի է՝ առ  
Աբաս Աղուանից Կաթողիկոս*

[428r] 1. Սրբոյ եւ աստուածասիրի երանելոյ հոգեւոր  
եղբօր եւ պաշտօնակցի մերոյ Աբասայ եպիսկոպոսի  
Աղուանից՝ ի Յոհաննէ եպիսկոպոսապետէ  
Երուսաղէմի:

Աստուածասէր Թումաս, երանելոյ Պանտավանաց  
վանական, ըստ սովորութեանն՝ որպէս յառաջ քան  
զմեզ յաջորդեալք սուրբ աթոռոյն Յակովբայ Եղբօր  
Տեառն, առեալ էր գիր հաւատոյ եւ կարգաց եկեղեցոյ,  
[428v] նոյնպէս եւ ի մէջ խնդրեաց եւ մատոյց տօմարս  
երկուս ժողովոյ, որ առանց Քրիստոսի ժողովեալ էր ի  
Տայս հակառակ սրբոյ Եկեղեցոյ, եւ զանձինս իրեանց  
ի ժառանգութենէն Քրիստոսի ի բաց հանին. զմին՝ զոր  
առաքեալ իսկ էր ի ձեր աշխարհոյ, զի որոգայթեցեն

*The letter from John, Bishop of Jerusalem, to Abas,  
Catholicos of the [Caucasian] Albanians.*

1. To our blessed spiritual brother and coworker,<sup>36</sup>  
the saintly and God-loving Abas, bishop of the  
Caucasian Albanians, from John, Archbishop of  
Jerusalem.

The God-loving T'umas,<sup>37</sup> monk of the blessed  
monastery of Pant,<sup>38</sup> as was customary [for him]  
prior to our succession to the Holy See of James the  
Brother of the Lord, had taken a letter on faith and  
church orders. Similarly, he solicited and delivered  
the two documents of the council devoid of Christ  
that was convened in Armenia contrary to the holy  
Church,<sup>39</sup> removing themselves from the inheritance  
of Christ: one, which was surely destined for your  
country, to make you stumble into their perdition,

a Յոհաննոս] Յոհաննու

36 A conventional address, an acknowledgment of spiritual kinship with hierarchs of the Church, corresponding to *πνευματικός ἀδελφός και συνεργός*. Cf. the conventional formula of salutation in the Letter closing (§19).

37 The courier is mentioned again, by name, with reference to documents he had carried previously (§16).

38 The prominence of this monastery, located on the east side of the Mount of Olives and dedicated to St. John the Baptist, is accentuated by the fact that it is the first of the Caucasian-Albanian monasteries cited by Anastas Vardapet in his list of sixth-century "Armenian" monasteries in Jerusalem, and so quoted in Kałankatuac'i, *History of the Caucasian Albanians*, 2.52: "The monastery of Pand [*sic*], located on the east side of the Mount of Olives, built first by a certain hermit named Panon from Caucasian Albania and now held by a Caucasian-Albanian priest named Peter" (based on ed. Aṙak'elyan, 285–86; cf. trans. Dowsett, 184–85). The monastery seems to have been named after Pand, an early head of the Caucasian-Albanian Church (3.23, ed. Aṙak'elyan, 342; cf. trans. Dowsett, 228). For this and other monasteries populated by Caucasian-Albanian compatriots among others from the Caucasus, see N. Covakan (Polarian), "Ałuanakan vank'er" ("Caucasian-Albanian Monasteries"), in idem, *Vanatur: Banasirakan yoducneru Žolovacoy*, Greeter: Collection of Philological Essays (Jerusalem, 1993), 130–35; Tchekhanovets, *Caucasian Archaeology of the Holy Land*, 14–15, 18, 21, 227. For a critical assessment, see Terian, "Rereading the Sixth-Century List of Jerusalem Monasteries by Anastas Vardapet," 273–88.

39 On the documents, see n. 9. On the agenda(s) of Nersēs II, see Stopka, *Armenia Christiana*, 71–76.



զձեզ յիւրեանց կորուստն, եւ զսիւսն սահման հաւատոյ յիւրեանց ամբարըշտութեանն<sup>a</sup>, յորում եւ ուսոյց զմեզ վասն բարեսէր կամաց Երանութեան Զում: Եթէ ընդ բարութ ճանապարհի հաւատոյ եւ գործոյ ընթանաս. զոր մեր լուեալ՝ յոյժ ուրախ եղաք: Բայց լուաք, թէ ոմանք յիշխանութենէդ քումմէ ընկալան զայնպիսի սնտոի եւ ստեղծական բանս խաբէութեան եւ Սրբութիւնդ Զո ոչ ել ի վերայ նոցա:

2. Ո՞չ գիտես, եթէ զամենայն իրս առաքինութեան որ գործիցէ եւ նախանձ ոչ ունիցի՝ ո՛չ է կատարեալ սէր ի նմա. «Զի կատարեալ սէր ի բաց մերժէ զերկեղ» եւ նախանձեցուցիչ առաւելեալ սիրոյ առ Աստուած, որպէս Փենէիէզին<sup>b</sup> եւ Եղիայն, որ վասն նախանձուն Աստուծոյ գովեցան ի Տեառնէ, որ ասաց իսկ ինքն, եթէ «Ես Աստուած նախանձոտ եմ եւ զփառս իմ այլում ոչ տամ եւ ոչ զքաջութիւնս իմ դրօշելոց»: Արդ մեք, որ ըստ նմանութեան Աստուծոյ արարաք, պարտիմք զԱրարչին մերոյ ունել զնախանձ, որպէս եւ<sup>c</sup> Պողոս ասէ, եթէ «Նախանձաւորք լերուք գործոց բարեաց» Եւ ոչ է արժան տալ զփառս Աստուծոյ Եւտիքի եւ Եւսեբի եւ Պետրոսի Անտիոքացոյ եւ Յովիանոսի Ադիկառնացոյ, եւ ոչ զքաջութիւն Աստուծոյ Աբդիշոյ Ասորոյ, որ եղել առաջնորդ կորստեանն Տայոց եւ կամ

and the other defining their iniquitous faith.

Therewith he informed us about the benevolent will of Your Beatitude, that you are advancing well in the path of faith and works.<sup>40</sup> We rejoiced greatly upon hearing this. But we heard [also] that some who were given [ecclesial] authority by you have accepted vain and fabricated words of deception, and that Your Holiness did not oppose them.

2. Do you not know that if one were to observe all deeds of virtue but have no zeal, there is no perfect love in him?<sup>41</sup> *For perfect love banishes fear* (1 John 4:18) and makes [one] more zealous in love for God, like Phinehas and Elijah,<sup>42</sup> who for their zeal for God were praised by the Lord, who himself said: *I am a zealous God and do not bestow my glory on another, nor my power on idols* (Isaiah 42:8).<sup>43</sup> Now we, who were created in the likeness of God,<sup>44</sup> owe zeal to our Creator, as Paul admonishes: *be zealous for good works* (Galatians 4:18). Thus, it is not proper to cede God's glory to Eutyches<sup>45</sup> and Eusebius<sup>46</sup> and Peter of Antioch<sup>47</sup> and Julian of Halicarnassus;<sup>48</sup> nor the power of God to Abdisho the Syrian,<sup>49</sup> who became the lead [cause] for the perdition of the Armenians,

a ամբարըշտութեանն] ամբարշտութեանն

b Փենէիէզին] Փենեիէզին

c եւ] u.

40 The reference to “faith and works” evokes the Epistle of St. James (2:14–26), the local importance of which lends itself to John's authority as a successor to the Apostle and to the authority with which he writes. Cf. the end of §13.

41 Echoing Jas 2:8–13.

42 On Phinehas, see Num 25:1–13; on Elijah, 1 Kgs (3 Kgdms) 18:20–40; 19:14.

43 Conflating the Isaianic passage with the Pentateuchal references to a jealous God (Deut 5:9; 6:15; cf. Exod 20:5; 34:14). Arm. *naxanj* means both “zeal” and “jealousy”; cf. Gk. *zēlos*.

44 Allusion to Gen 1:26–27.

45 Eutyches of Constantinople (ca. 370–ca. 456), the primary proponent of monophysitism.

46 Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Arian bishop of the metropolis from ca. 318, famed for baptizing Constantine the Great shortly before his death in 337; later patriarch of Constantinople (in office 338–341). He led the extreme Arian party that came to be known as Eusebians.

47 Peter Gnapheus or Fullo (the “Fuller”), patriarch of Antioch (in office 469–471, 476, 485–488), who added the words *ὁ σταυρωθείς δι’ ἡμᾶς* to the *trisagion* hymn (see §14).

48 Julian (d. after 527), a staunch Eutychian, was the primary proponent of apothartodocetism.

49 Of Sareba. On whom see n. 19.

ժողովոյն Հայոց: Հայեա՛ց եւ տես թէ ո՛րպէս [429r] Հեղի եւ ազգն նորա մերժեցան յերեսաց Աստուծոյ ի չքահանայանալն նմա. եւ դարձեալ զի ասէ, թէ «Վա՛յ որ գործէ զգործ Տեառն հեղգութեամբ». Եւ դարձեալ զթագաւորացն Իսրայէլի որպէս ասէ, թէ «Արարին ուղութիւնս առաջի Աստուծոյ, սակայն ի բարձանց ոչ մեկնեցան», զի տակաւին ժողովուրդն զոհէր ի բարձունս եւ խունկս արկանէր թոյլ տալ թագաւորացն ժողովրդեանն զոհել ի բարձունսն, եթէ կցորդք են մեղաց նոցա: Քանզի Պաւղոսի զնոյն երկեղկալեալ յանձին ասէր, թէ Անպարտ եմ ես յարենէ՛ ձերմէ, քանզի ո՛չ խորշեցայ պատմել ձեզ զամենայն կամս Աստուծոյ: Եւ դարձեալ ասէր. «Զգո՛յ՛ լերուք ի շանց անտի, զգո՛յ՛ լերուք ի չար մշակաց անտի», «որ զան առ ձեզ զգեստուք ոչխարաց եւ ինքեանք են զայլք յափշտակողք»: «Շո՛ւնս» կոչեաց զայնպիսիսն վասն լրբութեան նոցա եւ անառակութեան, եւ «զայլս» կոչեաց վասն յանդգնութեան նոցա, «չար մշակս» վասն զի նենգեն զբանն Աստուծոյ, եւ «զգեստուք ոչխարաց», որպէս թէ կերպարանօք ճշմարտութեան, որ զչար որոմունս մշակութեան իրեանց մինչեւ այսր սերմանեցին. 3. զորս եւ նզովեցի եւ հալածեցի եւ քաղաքս դեռ այրէր զվանսն մի հայոց. մինչեւ հալածեալքն առ թագաւորն գնացին՝ ասելով, եթէ «Հալածեաց զմեզ հայրապետն Երուսաղէմի»:

or for the council<sup>50</sup> of the Armenians. Behold and consider how Eli and his clan were rejected before God because of his unpriestly behavior.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, [scripture] says: *Woe to him who does the Lord's work negligently* (Jeremiah 48:10). And of the kings of Israel it says: *They did right before God . . . ; however, they did not abandon the high places* (2 Kings [4 Kingdoms] 12:2–3), for the people continued to offer sacrifices in high places and to burn incense. The kings allowed the people to sacrifice in the high places, thus partaking of their sin. As Paul, abiding by that same fear, says of himself: *I am innocent of your blood, for I did not shy away from telling you about all of God's will* (Acts 20:26–27). He also says: *Beware of those dogs; beware of those cultivators of evil* (Philippians 3:2), *those who come to you in sheep's clothing, who themselves are rapacious wolves* (Matthew 7:15).<sup>52</sup> Their like he called “dogs” because of their lewdness and recklessness; and he called [them] “wolves” because of their daring; and “cultivators of evil” because they twist the word of God; and “in sheep's clothing” for their pretense of truth, [like] those who have sown thus far the evil weeds of their cultivation.<sup>53</sup> 3, whom I anathematized and chased out while one of the city's Armenian monasteries was set on fire.<sup>54</sup> Eventually, those who were chased out went to the emperor,<sup>55</sup> saying, “The Patriarch of Jerusalem has chased us out.”

50 The singular here seems to point to the Second Council of Dwin (554/5).

51 Reference to 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 2:12–4:22.

52 Cited also in the letter of Yovhannēs II (Addendum, §2). Cf. Acts 20:29.

53 Allusion to “The Parable of the Weeds” (Matt 13:24–30). Vardanian unduly separates the sections here.

54 On tensions between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians during this period in Palestinian monasticism, see the references in n. 1.

55 Arm. *t'agawor* (“king”), corresponding to Gk. *basileus*, the foremost title reserved for the emperor in Constantinople, replacing the old Latin title of Augustus (kings outside the Byzantine realm were referred to as *regas*, from Lat. *rex*); cf. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De ceremoniis aulae byzantinae*. See J. B. Bury, “The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenetos,” *EHR* 22 (1907): 209–27, 417–39; A. Cameron, “The Construction of Court Ritual: The Byzantine Book of Ceremonies,” in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. D. Cannadine and S. Price

Իսկ Բարեպաշտութիւն Նորա գրեաց առ մեզ, եթէ «Բարիոք արարեր ըստ կանոնաց զիրսդ խնդրելով. զի եթէ այդպիսեաց թոյլ ոք տացէ իւրեանց ամբարշտութեան, եւ այլ ճարակ աստ գտանեն, զոր դժուար ոք կարէ ուղղել՝ մանաւանդ զարտաքին ազգոյ, որ ոչ կարեն իմանալ [429v] զմիտս գրոց եւ ըստ յառաջընկալ սովորութեան իւրեանց զչարափառութիւն իբրեւ զբարեպաշտութիւն համարին: Այլ եւ հերձուածոյ իսկ Տայոց անգլուխ է եւ ընդ բազում հերձուածս միատրի: Եւ իբրեւ ի գրոց ինչ ոչ կարացին ցուցանել իշխանքն հայոց, առ իս աղաչանս առաքեցին, եթէ առաջին թագաւորքն զվանս զայն մեզ իբրեւ զպարգեւ շնորհեցին նովիսք ուսմամբն: Որոց արարի պատասխանի, թէ անհնար է թագաւորաց հերձուածս պարգեւ շնորհել: Եւ ապա իբրեւ ոչինչ ելս գտեալ՝ լռեցին: Բայց դու իմով հրամանաւ զհերձուածողսդ հա՛ն եւ զվանսդ ուղղափառաց տո՛ւր, եւ յելելոցն, որք կամէին ըստ եկեղեցոյ լինել, եթէ եւ ձեռնագրաւ զհերձուածսն նզովեն՝ մի՛ արգելութ, այլ սիրով ընկալարութ քանզի տգէտք են»:

However, His [Imperial] Piety wrote to us, “You have acted well in pursuit of canonical matters. For if one were to allow their kind of impiety, and should they find pasture here, one would find it difficult to rectify it especially [among peoples of] far-off nations, who are incapable of comprehending the mind of scripture and who consider the immorality of their former habits as piety. Moreover, this very heresy of the Armenians is senseless<sup>56</sup> and encompasses many heresies. And because the Armenian princes<sup>57</sup> could not refer to anything from the scriptures [sc. in defense of their faith], they have sent petitions to me, [stating] that [our] former kings had bequeathed to us that monastery [sc. which was set on fire] with its learning facilities. I replied to them that ‘it is inconceivable for heretical kings to make [such a] bequest.’<sup>58</sup> And finding no way out, they fell silent thereafter. But [as for] you, on my order, expel these heretics and give the[ir] monasteries to the Orthodox and to recanters who are willing to adhere to the Church, who anathematize heresies in writing. Do not prevent them, but receive them with love, for they are unschooled.”

(Cambridge, 1987), 106–36. It should be noted that Armenians had no kingship in the sixth century.

56 *Arm. anglux* (lit. “headless”), corresponding to Gk. *akephalos*, a term (pl.) used to describe Miaphysites; q.v. (sense 3) in G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961), 61.

57 Presumably the mediators for the monks expelled from Jerusalem, the princely dynasts, on whom see n. 13.

58 Literally, the sentence reads “it is inconceivable for kings to bequeath heresies.” The gist of the sentence is not entirely clear, and a possible mistranslation—if not a corruption in the *Vorlage*(n)—is to be suspected here (*αἱρέσεις* from *αἱρετικοίς*). Taking the plural noun *herjuacs* (“heresies”) as an adjective, Garsoian renders with some justification: “... des rois hérétiques ne pouvaient faire de dons” (*L’Église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, 492; cf. “Le témoignage d’Anastas vardapet sur les monastères arméniens,” 264). The emperor seems to imply that the claim of the petitioning princes about the bequest is unfounded. To be sure, the Christian Arsacid kings after Trdat (Tiridates) III (r. 298–330) were Arian sympathizers. The Armenian Arsacid dynasty came to an end with the deposition of its last monarch, Artašēs or Artašir III/IV by the Sasanians in 428. On the Armenian Arsacids, see eadem, “The Aršakuni Dynasty (A.D. 12 [180?]-428),” in *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*, ed. R. G. Hovannisian, 2 vols. (New York, 1997), 1:63–94.

4. Այնպէս եւ ի հայրապետէ նորա գիր ընկալա<sup>a</sup>, եթէ «Բարեպաշտ թագաւորս մեր ինձ ասաց, եթէ ‘Վասն եկեղեցոյ իրաց զիս աշխատ զի’ առնէք. մեզ արտաքին իրաց եւ պատերազմաց է հոգալ, եկեղեցոյ եւ ճշմարիտ հաւատոյ գործ եպիսկոպոսաց է՝ քննեցէ՛ք եւ հաստատուն պահեցէ՛ք եւ զիս եւ զաշխարհս’»: 5. Իսկ եւ կոչեցի զիշխանս Հայոց եւ բազում ինչ խօսեցա<sup>b</sup>, եւ նոքա զԿեսարիա կալան բարորս. եւ ես ասեմ, թէ ‘Կեսարիայն հաճոյ է ձեզ, երթա՛յք ի Կեսարիայն կացէք. բայց յերկուս քաղաքս թագաւորականս յայտնի հերձուածողի ոչ տամք բնակել՝ ի յերուսաղէմ Երկնաւոր Թագաւորին եւ մերս երկրաւոր, եւ վասն այլ տիեզերաց իւրաքանչիւր եպիսկոպոսունք դատապարտին, [430r] եթէ անփոյթ առնեն’։ Եւ ապա Հայք հաղորդեցան, եւ եթէ մնաց<sup>c</sup> ոք՝ հաղորդել<sup>d</sup> ունին։ 6. Բայց դու տէ՛ր, ըստ թագաւորի հրամանին զվանսդ կարգաւորեա՛յ<sup>e</sup> եւ մաքուր պահեա՛յ<sup>f</sup> զքաղաքսդ»։<sup>g</sup>

Եւ ես նոյնպէս կարգաւորեցի, որպէս թագաւորն հրամայեաց. Այլ եւ այլ վանորեայսդ որ ի քաղաքիս եւ որ արտաքոյ, զոր միանկամ<sup>h</sup> ծանուցին՝ ըստ եկեղեցոյ կարգաւորեցի։ Եւ ես թպէտ եւ ցօժարէի յայլոց ի թագաւորութիւն այդպիսի ինչ գրել, բայց յորժամ չարալուր գիրն հայոց ի լսելիս իմ եհաս,

4. Similarly, I received a recent letter from his patriarch,<sup>59</sup> stating, “Our Pious Emperor<sup>60</sup> told me, ‘Why do you engage me in affairs of the church? We have to be concerned with external affairs and wars. Matters of church and orthodoxy belong to bishops; examine [them] and keep [them] firm for me and for my country.’”<sup>61</sup> 5. So I summoned the Armenian princes and spoke about many things. They kept clinging to Caesarea, but I said, ‘If Caesarea pleases you, go stay in Caesarea.’<sup>62</sup> We do not allow obvious heretics to dwell in two royal cities: in Jerusalem of the Heavenly King and in ours, the earthly. As for elsewhere in the inhabited world,<sup>63</sup> every bishop would be condemned if he acts negligently.’<sup>64</sup> Thereafter the Armenians were in communion. For one to stay [here], they need to be in communion. 6. As for your lordship, set your monasteries in order, in accordance with the imperial command, and keep your cities clean.”

Thus, I set things in order, as the Emperor commanded. The various monasteries inside and outside the city, known collectively, I set in ecclesial order. And I was not eager to write such things to others within the Empire.<sup>65</sup> But when the Armenian letter of evil tidings reached my hearing, I was obliged

a ընկալա] ընկալայ

b խօսեցա] խօսեցայ

c մնաց] մնայ

d հաղորդել] հաղորդիլ

e կարգաւորեայ] կարգաւորեա

f պահեայ] պահեա

g Բայց դու . . . զքաղաքսդ] transposition from the end of §4.

h միանկամ] միանգամ

59 The ecumenical patriarch, John III Scholasticus.

60 Justin II rather than his adoptive son, Tiberius II Constantine (r. 578–582), who was named Caesar and regent in 574 because of Justin’s insanity. It should be noted that the maltreatment—if not outright persecution—of the Miaphysites as heretics began with Justin II’s reign, and with Patriarch John III’s hardened position following his earlier attempts at reconciling Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians; see J. A. Evans, *The Power Game in Byzantium: Antonina and the Empress Theodora* (London, 2011), xiii.

61 The words here attributed to the emperor seem to counter somewhat his words quoted in §3.

62 The reference here is to the Gregorid heritage, which began with the Parthian-born St. Gregory the Illuminator’s Christian upbringing in Cappadocian Caesarea and eventual consecration there as bishop of Armenia at the turn of the fourth century, a history famed by the pseudonymous Agathangelos; see R. W. Thomson, trans., *The Lives of Saint Gregory: The Armenian, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac Versions of the “History” Attributed to Agathangelos* (Ann Arbor, 2010).

63 Arm. *tiezerk*’; Gk. *oikoumenē*.

64 Text has plural verbs with singular subject.

65 A remarkable claim, since Caucasian Albania/Arran, an ancient country stretching from Dagestan through present-day Azerbaijan, had never been part of the Roman/Byzantine Empire.



հարկաւորեցայ գրել. Քանզի մեզ զահն Տեառն գիտելով չափ, ով եղբարք, ոչ է պարտ ծովանալ եւ թոյլ տալ. քանզի ասէ. «Ահ մեծ է անկանել ի ձերս Աստուծոյ կենդանոյ»: «Վասն զի դէտ կացոյց զմեզ Աստուած ի վերա<sup>a</sup> տանն Իսրայէլի.<sup>b</sup> ապա եթէ դէտն ոչ աղաղակեսցէ եւ ոչ զգուշացուցանիցէ՝ զարիւն նոցա ի ձեռաց դէտին խնդրեցից»: Արդ, մի՛ եղբարք պարտական արեան գոցուք յատուրն յայնմիկ, յորժամ բանք սպառնին եւ գործք թագաւորեն, այլ մանաւանդ ըստ Պաւղոսի, որպէս վերագոյնն ասացաք, թէ «Անապարտ եմ եւ յարենէ՛ ձերմէ, քանզի ոչ խորշեցա՞ւ պատմել ձեզ զամենայն կանսն Աստուծոյ»: Ձայս աղերսելով ասէր Պաւղոս. իսկ դարձեալ եւ սաստիւք ասէ. «Յանդիմանեա՛, սաստեա՛, միսիթարեա՛ ամենայն սաստիւ, զի մի ոք իցէ, որ զքո մանկութիւնդ արհամարհիցէ»:

7. Նոյնպէս եւ Սրբութեանդ Չերոյ պարտ է հովել<sup>d</sup> եւ վարդապետել զհաւատացեալ ձեզ յԱստուծոյ հօտդ ամենայն զգուշութեամբ, հայել ի պատուիրանս Աստուծոյ եւ քննել զգիրս սուրբս, որպէս եւ [430v] Տէրն ասաց, թէ «Քննեցէ՛ք զգիրս եւ տեսէք, յորս համարիք ունել զկեանսն յախտենից»: Եւ դարձեալ առաքեալն ասէ. թէ «Հանապազ քննէին զգիրս եւ տեսանէին, թէ այս այսպէս իցէ». եւ ոչ որպէս հայքդ առանց քննելոյ զպատուիրանս Աստուծոյ՝ անկան ի վախից եւ հեռացուցին զանձինս իրեանց ի միաբանութենէ եկեղեցոյ եւ աստարացան ի շնորհացն Աստուծոյ:

8. Արդ, դո՛ւք եղբարք, զհետ երթայք սուրբ եկեղեցոյ եւ մի յաջ եւ մի յահեակ խոտորիք՝ ունելով զհաատս սուրբ Եկեղեցոյ, զոր ուսայք ի սուրբ առաքելոյն եւ ի նորին աշակերտացն՝ մինչեւ ի մեր ժամանակս անվրէպ

to write. For we know the measure of the fear of the Lord. O brothers, we must be neither idle nor lenient; for [scripture] says: *It is very dreadful to fall into the hands of the living God* (Hebrews 10:31). *For God has appointed us to be watchmen over the house of Israel. . . . But if the watchman does not cry out and warn, . . . I will require their blood from the watchman's hands* (Ezekiel 33:7, 6). Now, brothers, do not be found [as] debtors to blood on that day when words are muted and deeds rule. Rather, as I quoted Paul above: *I am innocent of your blood, for I did not shy away from telling you about all of God's will* (Acts 20:26–27).<sup>66</sup> Paul said this pleadingly. Furthermore, he speaks about reproof: *Rebuke, reprove, comfort with every reproof. . . lest anyone should have contempt for your youth* (2 Timothy 4:2; 1 Timothy 4:12).

7. Likewise, it behooves Your Holiness to shepherd and to teach the flock entrusted to you by God, with all carefulness, considering the commandments of God and searching the Holy Scriptures, as the Lord said: *Search the Scriptures and see, [for] in them you think you have eternal life* (John 5:39). Furthermore, the Apostle [*sic*] says: *They searched the Scriptures daily and saw that this is so* (Acts 17:11), and not as the Armenians [do] without searching the commandments of God. They were cast down and distanced themselves from the unity of the Church and became strangers to God's grace.

8. Now, you brothers, follow the holy Church and do not stray to the right or to the left, having the faith of the holy Church, which you learned from the holy Apostle and from his disciples,<sup>67</sup> inerrant and

a վերա] վերայ

b Իսրայէլի] Իսրայէլի

c խորշեցա] խորշեցայ

d հովել] հովուել

66 Cited verbatim in §2.

67 The acknowledged apostolic heritage of Abas's church is not specified. Although the churches of the South Caucasus share a common ecclesial heritage, thanks to the work of St. Gregory the Illuminator (ca. 257–ca. 331), there was an earlier stratum of Christianity in Armenia, owing to Edessan missionaries who introduced the Thaddaeian apostolic tradition. This was appropriated for the Illuminator, who is said to have been conceived on the site of Thaddaeus's grave, thus continuing the latter's mission (see Thomson, *Lives of Saint Gregory*, 50; on the later Bartholomeian apostolic tradition, making headway on the grounds that Thaddaeus was one of the "Seventy" and not one of the "Twelve," see M. van Esbroeck, "The Rise of Saint Bartholomew's Cult in Armenia from the Seventh to the Thirteenth Centuries," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. T. J. Samuelian and M. E. Stone, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 6 [Chico, CA, 1983], 161–78).

եւ անսխալ: Զի թէպէտ եւ հերձուածք եղեն բազում ի յաշխարհի, որպէս եւ Պաղոս ասէր, եթէ «Ներձուածք լինելոց են՝ զի ընտիրքն երեւեսցին». եւ դարձեալ Պետրոս ասաց, եթէ «Որպէս սիրելի եղբայրն մեր Պաղոս, ըստ տուեցելոյ նմա իմաստոյթեան, բազում ինչ դժուարիմացս ասաց ի թողթսն անդ իւրում, զոր անուանաւքն եւ յողորդոյքն կամակորեն առ ի կորուստ անձանց»: Իսկ մեք, այսինքն սուրբ Եկեղեցի, զայս տէրունական ձայն ունինք, որ ասաց ց'Պետրոս՝ գլովս առաքելոցն, տալով նմա զգլխատրոյթին հաւատոյ անշարժութեան եկեղեցեաց, եթէ՝<sup>a</sup> «Դու եւ վէմ եւ ի վերայ այդր վիմի շինեցից զեկեղեցի իմ՝ եւ դրունք մի յաղթահարեսցեն զնա՝<sup>b</sup>». որում եւ զփականս երկնի եւ երկրի ետ՝ Պետրոսի, եւ որ մինչեւ ցայսօր ժամանակի զհաւատոց նորա զհետ երթան՝ աշակերտք նորա եւ վարդապետք կաթողիկէ եկեղեցոյ, կապեն եւ արձակեն. Զչարսն կապեն, եւ որ զան յապաշխարոյթին եւ ի զղջումն՝ արձակեն ի կապանաց. մանաւանդ սուրբ եւ գլխատր եւ պատուական այթոռոյն նորա ժառանգորդք

faultless, down to our time. Surely there are countless heresies in the world, as Paul used to say: *There have to be heresies, in order that those who are approved may become evident* (1 Corinthians 11:19). Moreover, Peter said: *As our dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, said many difficult things in his letters, which the ignorant and unstable twist, to their own perdition* (2 Peter 3:15–16). Whereas we, that is the holy Church, have this dictum of the Lord, which he spoke to Peter, the head of the Apostles, giving him the primacy [in terms] of the Church's<sup>68</sup> unshakeable faith: *You are the rock, and on that [very] rock I will build my church, and the gates will not prevail against it* (Matthew 16:18). To him, to Peter, he also gave the keys of heaven and earth,<sup>69</sup> and to this day in time his disciples and the teachers of the catholic Church follow his faith. They bind and loose. They bind evil and release from the shackles those who come with repentance and remorse, especially those who are heirs to his holy, primary, and honorable throne,<sup>70</sup>

a եթէ] թէ

b զնա corr. զղա] զղա

Moreover, a grandson of the Illuminator, Grigoris (martyred in 337/8; q.v. “Grigoris” in Garsoïan, *Epic Histories*, 376–77), was appointed the first bishop of Caucasian Albania. With the ecclesial struggles for autonomy as much as over Chalcedon as of the middle of the sixth century, the Caucasian Albanians must have embraced yet another apostolic tradition: that of Eliseus/Elišay, said to be a disciple of the apostle James of Jerusalem. The earliest extant source on the latter development is Kalankatuac'i, *History of the Caucasian Albanians*, 2.42—seventh century (ed. Aṙak'elyan, 261; trans. Dowsett, 168); cf. Howard-Johnston, “Caucasian Albania and Its Historian,” 353–55. See also the *History of the Secession of the Iberians* (*Vasn bažanman Vrac'*) by the tenth-century historian Uxtanēs of Edessa, who writes about it when recounting territorial partitions during the reign of Emperor Maurice (r. 582–602) following the Byzantine-Persian wars of 572–91 (*Matenagirk' Hayoc' [Armenian Classical Authors]*, vol. 15. Tenth Century: *ŽE Hator: Ž Dar*, 2 pts. [Antilias, Lebanon, 2010], 2:510–608). For more, see M. van Esbroeck, “Primaute, patriarchats, catholicosats, autocéphalies en Orient,” in *Il primato del vescovo di Roma nel primo millennio: Ricerche e testimonianze. Atti del simposio storico-teologico Roma 9–13 ottobre 1989*, ed. M. Maccarone (Vatican City, 1991), 493–521; idem, “On the Historical Background of the Early Sources Regarding the Churches in the Caucasus,” *St. Nersess Theological Review* 9 (2004): 5–24; and the broader discussion by Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, 283–353.

68 Lit., “of the churches.”

69 Allusion to Matt 16:19.

70 The author's understanding of Petrine primacy is substantially clear, viewed as the shared, collective authority by all who hold the office of a bishop.

[431r] ուղիղ հաւատովք անսղալ<sup>a</sup> ըստ տէրունական ձայնին, որպէս յառաջագոյն ասացաք, որոց հօտք<sup>b</sup> են այսոքիկ.

9. Հաւատամք ի Հայր եւ յՈրդի եւ ի Հոգին<sup>c</sup> սուրբ Աստուած ճշմարիտ. խոստովանիմք մի էութիւն, որ է մի բնութիւն, երեք անձիւք, երեք դէմք, երեք կերպարանք՝ Հօր եւ Որդոյ եւ Հոգոյն սրբոյ. միատրեմք զԱստուածութիւնն, զտէրութիւնն, զանսկզբնական զօրութիւնն, որոշեմք զառանձնատրութիւնն: Զի Հայր Աստուած է եւ արարիչ եւ ամենակալ, անսկիզբն եւ անպատճառ, ծնող եւ ոչ ծնունդ: Եւ Որդի Աստուած է եւ արարիչ եւ ամենակալ, անսկիզբ<sup>d</sup>ն՝ ծնունդ եւ ոչ ծնաւ որոյ պատճառք Հայր, անճառապէս Աստուած Բան: Եւ Հոգի սուրբ Աստուած է եւ արարիչ եւ ամենակալ՝ ընդ Հօր եւ ընդ Որդոյ<sup>d</sup>, եւ յօղ, Հոգի սուրբ եւ մխիթարիչ:

Այսպէս խոստովանիմք վասն Հօր եւ Որդոյ եւ Հոգոյն սրբոյ աստուածութեանն: Իսկ վասն տնտեսութեան Տեառն մերոյ Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի այսպէս խոստովանիմք.

ԶՈրդի ծնեալ ի Հօրէ յառաջ քան զյաւիտեանս<sup>e</sup> անճառաբար<sup>f</sup>, իսկ ի վերջին ժամանկս վասն մեր եւ վասն մերոյ փրկութեան մարմնացեալ եւ մարդացեալ ի Մարիամն<sup>g</sup> սրբոյ կուսէ Աստուածածնէ, եւ լեալ մարդ կատարեալ՝ Աստուած ճշմարիտ, եւ զերկոսեան զբնութիւն՝ զաստուածութեան եւ զմարդկութեան, անշփոթ պահեալ ի միում անձին եւ ի միում կերպարանի, որ կոչի մի Տէր մեր Յիսուս Քրիստոս, Որդի Աստուծոյ

in the right faith, inerrant, in keeping with the Lord's dictum, as we just said. Their confession of faith<sup>71</sup> is as follows:

9. We believe in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, true God. We confess faith in one essence, that is, one nature of the three Subsistences, three Persons, three Representations:<sup>72</sup> Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. We proclaim the one Godhead, the Lordship, [and] the timeless Power. We define the[ir] distinction: for the Father is God and almighty Creator, without beginning and causation, begetter and not begotten; and the Son is God, Creator and Almighty, without beginning, begotten, not begetter, whose causation is the Father, ineffably God the Word; and the Holy Spirit is God and Creator and Almighty, with the Father and with the Son, the one who proceeds, Holy Spirit and Consoler.

We thus confess faith in the Godhead, of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit. As for the economy of our Lord Jesus Christ, we confess faith in this manner:

The Son, born ineffably of the Father, before the ages, yet in the end time, for our sake and for our salvation, took body and became man from the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Theotokos. And he became a perfect man [who is] true God, of two natures: divine and human, unconfused in the self-same Subsistence and self-same Representation,<sup>73</sup> who is called Our Only Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God.

a անսղալ] անսխալ

b հօտք/հատք] read հաւատք

c Հոգին] Հոգի

d Որդոյ] Յրդոյ

e զյաւիտեանս add. ան] om. ան

f անճառաբար] անճառապար

g Մարիամն] Մարիամայ

71 Reading *hawatk* ("faith") instead of *hawtk* ("flocks"), as suggested also by Vardanian, "Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief," 70 n. 2; he unduly separates the sections at this point. What follows seems to be more than just the author's own summation of the faith; the "established" statements are drawn from the early councils (see the beginning of §10; cf. the Chalcedonian definition or creed quoted in §12).

72 The three Arm. terms, *anjink*, *dēm̄k*, and *kerparank*, translate Gk. *hypostaseis*, *prosōpa*, and *homoīōmata*, respectively. Cf. §12.

73 The Arm. terms here are *anj* (Gk. *hypostasis*) and *kerparan* (Gk. *homoīōma*).

կենդանոյ, չարչարեալ եւ խաչեալ մարմնով, եւ անմահութեամբ անչարչարելի:

10. Ձայս հաւատս հաստատեցին միաբանութեամբ սուրբ հարքն չորից ժողովոյ<sup>a</sup>, այսինքն, որ ի Նիկիա ՅԺԸ, եպիսկոպոսք եւ որ ի Կոստանդնուպոլիս ԱԾ, եւ որ<sup>b</sup> յԵփեսոս առաջին ժողովն Մ, եւ որ ի Քաղկեդոն ՈԼ, սուրբ հարքն: Եւ վասն զի հայք [431v] յասորեաց խաբեցան, որ ելին արտաքոյ սրբոյ Եկեղեցոյ վասն նզովելոյ նոցա զսուրբ ժողովն Քաղկեդոնի, եւ անկան յաղանդն Յովսէփոսի Աղիկառնասացոյ, որ է եւ սայ<sup>c</sup> ի բուայ որոմանն Դեոսկորի եւ Եւտիքի եւ Թէոդորոսի<sup>d</sup>, զի սոքա երեքեան ի միում ժամանակի

a ժողովոյ] ժողովոց

b որ] add. ի

c սայ] սա

d Թէոդորոսի] read Թէոդորի

He suffered and was crucified in the flesh, yet [he is] impassible by virtue of immortality.<sup>74</sup>

10. This creed was established unanimously by the holy Fathers at the Four Councils, that is, by the 318 bishops at Nicaea, the 150 at Constantinople, the 200 at the First Council of Ephesus,<sup>75</sup> and the 630 holy Fathers at Chalcedon.<sup>76</sup> Nevertheless, the Armenians were deceived by the Syrians, who were cast out of the Church because of the anathema placed on them by the holy Council of Chalcedon and fell into the sect of Julian of Halicarnassus, himself a plant from the weed of Dioscorus<sup>77</sup> and Eutyches and Theodore;<sup>78</sup> for these

74 Retroversion to Greek yields the following: Πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀληθινὸς Θεός. Ὁμολογοῦμεν μίαν οὐσίαν, τὴν αὐτὴν μίαν φύσιν, τρεῖς [δὲ] ὑποστάσεις [καὶ] τρία πρόσωπα [καὶ] *τρεις* χαρακτῆρες τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Μίαν φάμεν [εἶναι] τὴν θεότητα, τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τὴν ἄχρο- νον δύναμιν. Διακρίνομεν τὴν ιδιότητα. Ὁ γὰρ Πατὴρ θεὸς ἔστι καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ παντοκράτωρ, ἀναρχὸς καὶ ἀναίτιος, γεννήτωρ καὶ ἀγέν- νητος. Καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς θεὸς ἔστι καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ παντοκράτωρ, ἀναρχος, γεννητὸς καὶ οὐ γεννήτωρ, αἰτία μὲν αὐτοῦ ὁ Πατήρ, ἀρρήτως ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος. Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον θεὸς ἔστι καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ παντο- κράτωρ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ σὺν Υἱῷ, ἐκπορευτὸν Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ παράκλητον.

Ὁὕτως ὁμολογοῦμεν περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ *Υἱοῦ* καὶ τοῦ *ἁγίου* Πνεύματος. *Περὶ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας* τοῦ *κυρίου* ἡμῶν *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* οὕτως ὁμολογοῦμεν.

Ὁ Υἱὸς, ἐγεννήθη δὲ ἀρρήτως ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸ αἰώνων, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου [καὶ] θεοτόκου Μαρίας σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, καὶ τέλος ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, ἀληθινὸς θεός, καὶ δύο φύσεις, τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἀσυγχύτους ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ προσώπῳ, εἰς κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος καλεῖται, παθόντα καὶ σταυρωθέντα τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἀθανάσιζα ἀπαθῆ [sic].

75 By implication, the author is cognizant of the Second Council of Ephesus, convened by Emperor Theodosius II in 449 and chaired by Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria (in office 444–451, d. 454); known also as “The Robber Council of Ephesus” for reversing the ruling of the 448 Council of Constantinople chaired by Patriarch (St.) Flavian (in office 446–449) that had deposed and excommunicated Eutyches.

76 As in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, the creed (§12) is here preceded by confirmation of the creeds of the previous councils, with nearly identical wording.

77 At Chalcedon, in acts retaliatory to the Second Council of Ephesus, Dioscorus of Alexandria (n. 75) was deposed and exiled to Gangra.

78 Text has Theodorus; read Theodore (of Mopsuestia, d. 428), who had been Nestorius's teacher in Antioch and who was condemned posthumously in 553, at the Second Council of Constantinople.



զմի ամպարշտութիւն քարոզեցին, որք եւ նգովեցան իսկ ի ժողովոյն որ վասն նոցա, եւ վասն ասելոյ նոցա, թէ զմարմինն Տէրն յերկնից ելեր, եւ ոչ ի կուսէն ինչ առ ամենեւին, այլ լոկ միայն ճանապարհորդեաց ընդ նա: Իսկ այլքս, որ ի սոցանէ բռան, այսինքն Տիմոթէոս Եղովրոս եւ Պետրոս Ծանրախօս, զոր Աղէքսանդրացի հայրապետս կոչեն, որք աքսորեցան վասն չար ամպարշտութեանն<sup>a</sup> իրեանց եւ մերժեցան ի ժառանգութենէն Բրիստոսի: Եւ դարձեալ Գայիոս եւ Սեբեր<sup>b</sup> եւ Պետրոս Անտիոքացի եւ Յովհաննոս Աղիկառնասացի, որք նորաձեւ իմն մուծին յաղանդն Եսոիքի, որպէս զի ցուցեն զանձինս իրեանց առ ի չար անտր<sup>c</sup> առաւել իմաստունս, եւ եղեն պատճառք կորստեան անձանց իրեանց եւ աշխարհի, զորոյ բարբանջմունս<sup>d</sup> որով այժմ հեռացան հայք յեկեղեցոյ, ասասցոյք:

II. Յովհաննոս Աղիկառնասացի ամբարշտեաց ասել, թէ մարմինն Բրիստոսի անապական եւ անմահ էր մինչեւ ցիւաչելութիւնն՝ որպէս յետ յարութեանն էր անապակաս եւ անմահ, նոյնպէս եւ յառաջ քան զյարութիւն. եւ մի բնութիւն ասաց Բանին եւ մարմնոյն Աստուծոյ, եւ շփոթումն եւ զանկումն եւ խառն անկումն արար, եւ զամենայն յոյս հաւատացելոց, որ ի ձեռն սուրբ խաչին եղեւ՝ ուրացաւ: Զի թէ անմահ եւ անապական էր մարմինն Բրիստոսի, որպէս ասացըն՝ անմահութեամբ ուրացաւ զչարչարանսն եւ անապականութեամբն [432r] զյարութիւնն, զի ուր մահ չէ՝ եւ ոչ խաչ է, եւ ուր անապականութիւն է<sup>e</sup>՝ յարութեան պէտս ոչ ունի: Վասն զի յարութիւն է, որ զապականացուն անապական առնէ, որպէս առաքեալ ասէ, թէ «Պարտ է ապականացուիս զգե՞նու զանապականութիւն եւ մահկանացուիս՝ զանմահութիւն». Զան զի ոչ նոյն ինքն է ապականացու բնութիւն եւ անապական, այլ ասեմք, եթէ միայն առանձին պատշաճ է Աստուծոյ բնութեանն եւ բովանդակ անապական եւ անշրջելի եւ անայլայլելի՝ եւ միշտ նոյնպէս ունի հանապազ. ո՛չ բարձումն եւ ո՛չ վերադրութիւն ունի, եւ անընդունակ է ախտից եւ մարմնաւոր

three simultaneously preached the same iniquity and were thus anathematized by the council held because of them and for what they proclaimed, that the Lord brought his body from heaven and that he received nothing at all from the Virgin—that he only journeyed through her. So were others who grew from them, that is, Timothy Aelurus and Peter the Stammerer, who are called Patriarchs of Alexandria,<sup>79</sup> who were exiled because of their gross iniquity and were denied Christ's inheritance. So were Gaius and Severus<sup>80</sup> and Peter of Antioch, and Julian of Halicarnassus, who in a novel way reintroduced the sect of Eutyches, as they revealed themselves to be more wicked than wise and became the cause of their own perdition and of the world, and by their profanity—we should say—were the Armenians distanced from the Church.

II. Julian of Halicarnassus was sacrilegious in saying that the body of Christ was incorruptible and immortal until the Crucifixion, as it was perfect and immortal after the Resurrection; that it was so before the Resurrection. He used to say also that the Word and the body of God are of one nature. He thus created confusion and fall, turmoil and loss of hope for the believers. He denied what was achieved through the Cross. For if the body of Christ was immortal and incorruptible, as he claimed, then by immortality he denied [the efficacy of] the Passion, and by incorruptibility [that of] the Resurrection. For where there is no death [of Christ], there is no Cross; and where there is incorruptibility, there is no need for the Resurrection. For it is the Resurrection that makes the corruptible incorruptible, as the Apostle says: *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal, immortality* (1 Corinthians 15:53). For the corruptible and the incorruptible are not of the same nature. For we say that it is proper only for God's nature to be thoroughly incorruptible and unchangeable and immutable, that it is always the

79 Deacon of Timothy (457–460, 475–477). Peter succeeded to the patriarchate upon the latter's death (in office 477–489); both were ardent proponents of miaphysitism at Chalcedon.

80 The text was misread by its first editor at this point. For *ews eber* read *ew Seber*, as suggested also by Vardanian, “Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief,” 71 n. 1. Severus (patriarch of Antioch, 512–538) was also condemned by the Armenians, albeit for a different reason; see the letter of Yovhannēs II (Addendum, §6).

a ամպարշտութեանն] ամպարշտութեան

b եւ Սեբեր] եւ Սեբեր

c անտր] անդր

d բարբանջմունս] բարբաջմունս

e է] om.

չարչարանաց եւ մահու, զի բաւանդակ անապական է Աստուծոյ բնութիւն, այսինքն սրբոյ եւ երկրպագելի միասնական սուրբ Երրորդութեանն<sup>a</sup>, ըստ առաքելոյ, որ ասէ. թէ «Բայց Թագաւորին յաւիտենից՝ անապականին եւ աներեւութին<sup>b</sup>, միայնոյն Աստուծոյ պատիւ եւ փառք յաւիտեանս»: Իսկ ապա եթէ ասիցես. Եւ ո՞չ մի ինչ պատիւ Քրիստոսի առաւել քան մեզ ո՞չ տայցենք՝ այս ոչ մեր ինչ է շնորհեալ Տեառն Քրիստոսի, քանզի ոչինչ է կարօտ, բայց ըստ Հշմարտութեան բանիցն ասենք, թէ վերագոյն քան զմեզ է մարմինն Տեառն եւ ըստ մեզ ամենեւին առանց մեղաց. վերագոյն քան զմեզ անմեղութեանն եւ միաբանութեան աստուածութեանն, քանզի ի սմանէ միաւորութիւն տնօրէնութեանն<sup>c</sup>, եւ ապա աստուածային եւ երկրպագելի. իսկ ընդունելութեանն անխոտելի ախտ իցէ՝ ըստ մեզ էր ըստ ամենայն, մինչեւ ի փրկական չարչարանս իւր եւ ի յարութիւն:

12. Իսկ զսուրբ եւ զտիեզերական ժողովն Քաղկեդոնի, զոր նգովեցին չայքոյ, որք մոլորեցան ի ձեռն Աբդիշոյի<sup>d</sup> աստորոյ եւ ելին արտաքոյ սուրբ եւ կաթողիկէ եկեղեցոյ՝ [432v] վասն ասելոյ սուրբ ժողովոյն զՏէր մեր Յիսուա Քրիստոս Աստուած կատարեալ եւ մարդ կատարեալ, Աստուած Հշմարիտ եւ մարդ Հշմարիտ, եւ յայտնապէս ցուցին զտնօրէնութեանն խորհուրդ, զոր եւ սուրբ ժողովն, որ վասն տնտեսութեան Տեառն մերոյ Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի ասացեալ է ի սուրբ հաւատս՝ զնոյն բանս եղից այնպէս.

Արդ, զիեւ երթալով այժմ զսուրբ հարցն մեք՝ եւ զնոյն խոստովանել Որդի զՏէր<sup>e</sup> մեր Յիսուա Քրիստոս համաձայն ամենեքեան ուսուցանեն<sup>f</sup>՝ կատարեալ զնոյն ինքն յաստուածութեան եւ կատարեալ զնոյն ինքն ի մարդկութեան, Աստուած Հշմարիտ եւ մարդ Հշմարիտ, նոյն ինքն ի հոգոյն բանականէ եւ ի մարմնոյ, եւ հաւասար չօր ըստ աստուածութեանն<sup>g</sup> եւ հաւասար նոյն ինքն ըստ մարդկութեանն՝

same: it needs no upgrading or improvement, and it is immune of contamination by impurity, physical suffering, or death. For the nature of God, that is, of the holy and worshipful union of the Holy Trinity, is thoroughly incorruptible. This is in accordance with the saying of the Apostle: *But to the King eternal, incorruptible,<sup>81</sup> invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever* (1 Timothy 1:17). Conversely, you would say, “Unless we give more honor to Christ than to ourselves, are we giving anything to Christ the Lord who needs nothing?” But with truthful words we say, “The Lord’s body is superior to ours, even though [he is] like us in every way except for sin.”<sup>82</sup> [He is] superior to us in [his] sinlessness and union with the Divine, whence the common economy, at once Divine and adorable; no despicable filth in [his] reception [of body]. He was like us in every way until his redemptive Passion and Resurrection.<sup>83</sup>

12. The Armenians, being misled by Abdisho the Syrian, anathematized the holy and universal Council of Chalcedon and left the holy and catholic Church on grounds that the holy council has said that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, true God and true man. They have openly revealed an evil mindset regarding the holy council that pronounced a sacred confession of faith pertaining to the economy of our Lord Jesus Christ. I shall state the [council’s] very words, as follows:

Now then, following the holy Fathers, confessing the self-same Son and our Lord Jesus Christ, we all unanimously teach that the self-same [Son] is perfect in divinity and the self-same [Son] is perfect in humanity: true God and true man [consisting] of the rational spirit and of a body; and that [he is] equal to the Father in divinity, and the self-same [Son] is equal in humanity—like us in every way except for

a Երրորդութեանն] Երրորդութեան

b աներեւութին] աներեւոյթին

c տնօրէնութեանն] տնօրէնութեան

d Աբդիշոյի] Աբդեշոյի

e զՏէր] եւ Տէր

f ուսուցանեն] read ուսուցանենք

g աստուածութեանն] աստուածութեան

81 Scripture has “immortal.”

82 Echoing Heb 4:15.

83 Glosses are to be suspected in these garbled lines following the scriptural citation. Vardanian notes: “nicht ganz verständlich” (“Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief,” 72 n. 2; so too Garsoïan, *L’Église arménienne et le grand schisme d’Orient*, 496 n. 39.)

ըստ ամենայնի նման մեզ, առանց մեղաց, որ յառաջ քան զյափտեանս ի Հօրէ ծնեալ ըստ աստուածութեան, ի վերջին ժամանակս ի Մարիամա<sup>a</sup> ի կուէ մարդկութեանս. մի զՏէր Յիսուս Զրիստոս յերկուս բնութիւնս՝ զՄիածինն, անշփոթելիս, անշրջելիս, անբաժանելիս, անմեկնելիս ծանուցեալ, եւ ոչ ուրեք բնութեանցն զանազանութիւն ի բաց բառնալոյ վասն միութեանն, այլ ողջ պահելով զերկաքանչիւր բնութիւն ի միում դէմս՝ ի մի անձն զուգապէս. ոչ յերկուս դէմս բաժանելով կամ մեկնելով<sup>b</sup>, այլ մի զնոյն Որդի, Միածին Աստուած. Բանն՝ Տէր Յիսուս Զրիստոս:

Զայս խոստովանութիւն ասացեալ է վասն տնտեսութեան Տեառն մերո՞ Յիսուսի Զրիստոսի<sup>d</sup> սուրբ ժողովոյն որ ի Խալկեդոն, զոր եւ զգիր հաւատոյն առաքեցաք Սրբութեանդ Չերում:

a Մարիամա] Մարիամայ

b կամ մեկնելով] om.

c մերո] մերոյ

d Զրիստոսի] om.

sin;<sup>84</sup> who, as for his divinity, was born of the Father, before eternity, and as for his humanity, [was born] of the Virgin Mary in the end time. One Lord Jesus Christ, in two natures the Only-begotten, unconfused, unchangeable, inseparable, the ineffable One made known; the distinction of the natures being in no way removed because of the union, but rather the properties of each nature being preserved in one Person, concurring in one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons,<sup>85</sup> but one and the self-same Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>86</sup>

This confession of faith about the economy of our Lord Jesus Christ was recited at the holy Council of Chalcedon. The very text of this creed we have sent to Your Holiness.

84 Again echoing Heb 4:15.

85 Here the translator uses *dēm* (and the pl. *dēms*) for Gk. *prosōpon* (pl. *prosōpa*), generally translated “person,” and *anj* for Gk. *hypostasis*, generally translated “subsistence” (cf. §9).

86 The Gk. text reads: Ἐπόμεινοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκουμεν [ἐκδιδάσκουμεν / ἐκδιδάσκουσι Arm.], τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀνθρωπὸν ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτόν, ἐκ [ἐκ / τῆς **add.** Arm.] ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου [τῆς θεοτόκου / **om.** Arm] κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν [Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν / κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν μονογενῆ Arm.] δύο φύσεσιν ἄσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμῶς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως καὶ [καὶ / **om.** Arm] εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ [καὶ / **om.** Arm] μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ’ ἕνα καὶ [καὶ / **om.** Arm] τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, θεὸν, λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

In addition to the variants indicated in square brackets, our text omits the rest: καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσεν καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδεδωκε σύμβολον (“As the Prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us”). Text in W. Kinzig, ed. and trans., *Faith in Formulae: A Collection of Early Christian Creeds and Creed-Related Texts*, 4 vols., Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford, 2017) 2:96 (§215).

13. Իսկ վասն երկուց բնութեանցն, զոր ասացին սուրբ հարքս այտոքիկ, ոչ նորաձեւութիւն ինչ մութիւն յեկեղեցի սուրբ, այլ որ ի սկզբանէն քարոզեալ էր ի սուրբ առաքելոցն եւ ի նոցին հետեւողացն, ի վարդապետաց եկեղեցոյ՝ [433r] զնոյն յայտնապէս ցուցին: Քանզի ասացին երկուս բնութիւնս միատրեալս ի Տեառն մերում Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի. ասեն անբաժանելիս, բայց ծանուցեալ եւ անշփոթս, քանզի որ զերկուս բնութիւնսն ոչ ամբողջ պահեսցէ ի Տեառնէն, այլ զմիւն միայն խոստովանի՝ ամենայն իրօք զմիւսն ուրանա<sup>a</sup>: Այլ ասիցես արդեալք. զի ա՞րդ հնար է երկուս, որպէս Աստուածաշունչ զիրք ասացին՝ այսինքն ստացականին եւ անստացականին. քանզի մարմինն ստացական էր, իսկ Աստուածութիւնն՝ անստացական. եւ ինքն իսկ Տէրն ցուցանէ զերկուս բնութիւնսն յինքեան՝ յայտնապէս ասէր վասն աստուածութեանն, եթէ «Ես եւ Տայր իմ մի եմք». եւ դարձեալ, եթէ «Մի՛ զարմանայք, եթէ Որդի Մարդոյ է, զի եկեսցէ ժամանակ, զի լսիցեն մեռեալք ձայնի Որդոյն Աստուծոյ», եւ որ ի կարգի: Իսկ վասն մարդկային բնութեանն<sup>b</sup>, թէ «Պարտ է Որդոյ Մարդոյ բազում չարչարել<sup>c</sup>». եւ դարձեալ, եթէ «Զի խնդրէք զիս՝ այր, որ զճշմարտութիւնն ձեզ խօսեցա<sup>d</sup>»: Զուգաբարբառ այսոցիկ քարոզն աշխարհի եւ առաքեալն Պաւլոս զերկուս բնութիւնսն Տեառն ի մի դէմս նշանակէ, ասէ. «Որ ի կերպարանս Աստուծոյ էր ոչինչ յափշտակութիւն համարեցաւ զլինելն հաւասար Աստուծոյ, այլ զանձն ունայնացոյց զկերպարանս ծառայի առեալ»: Արդ, ո՞ր զկերպարանս ծառայի դնիցես, զորոյ զբնութիւնն ի բաց ուրանալով համարձակի ասել՝ «Անմահ խաչեցար», եւ անուանին հոգեմարտք եւ աստուածաչարչարք: Բայց ձեզ ո՛չ է պարտ զհետ ասորեստանեացո՞ւ մոլորել, այլ գալ զհետ պատուիրանաց Տիեզերական Եկեղեցոյ Սուրբ Յարութեանն:

14. Թէպէտ եւ ոչ գիտութեամբ ունիք [433v] զմիտս հերձուածոյդ Դիոսկուրի եւ զԱնտիոքացոյն, որ «զանմահ»՝ «խաչեցարդ»

13. By speaking about the Two Natures, these holy Fathers did not introduce something new into the holy Church, but what was preached from the beginning by the holy Apostles and their followers, the teachers of the Church. They pointed out the same, manifestly; for they said the Two Natures are united in our Lord Jesus Christ. They said [these are] inseparable, but distinct and unconfused. For those who confess but one nature, not maintaining the unity of the two natures of the Lord, patently deny the other. You might possibly ask, “How could there be two since the books of the Bible distinguish<sup>87</sup> the created from the uncreated, since the body was created and the Divinity uncreated?” The Lord points to the two natures when referring to himself, speaking unambiguously of [his] Divinity: *For I and the Father are one* (John 10:30). And again: *Do not be astonished at the Son of Man. For a time is coming when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God* (John 5:28, 26). Similarly, with reference to the human nature: *The Son of Man must suffer many things* (Mark 8:31). And again: *Why do you seek [to kill] me, a man who has told you the truth?* (John 8:40). Parallel to this, the preacher and apostle to the world, Paul, assigns the two natures to one Person, saying: *Who, being in the likeness of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grabbed, but made himself nothing, taking the likeness of a servant?* (Philippians 2:6–7). Where will you place the likeness of a servant? This nature is blatantly denied when the Pneumatomachians and the Theopaschites say of the immortal One, “You were crucified.” You should not stray in the direction of the Syrians, but should follow the injunctions of the catholic Church of the Holy Resurrection.<sup>88</sup>

14. Perhaps unknowingly you have embraced the thinking of Dioscorus the heretic and of the Antiochene, who added “Who were crucified” after the [word] “Immortal” in the sacred hymn of the

a ուրանալ] ուրանայ

b բնութեանն] բնութեան

c չարչարել] չարչարիլ

d խօսեցալ] խօսեցայ

e ասորեստանեացոյ] ասորեստանեայցոյ

87 Lit., “say.”

88 Alluding possibly to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, more accurately called Church of the Resurrection or Church of the Anastasis (Ναός τῆς Αναστάσεως); thus, a likely claim for the centrality of the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and for the liturgy of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher as the paradigm to be followed.



աւելադրեցին ի սուրբ Երրորդութեանն<sup>a</sup> ձայնի եւ իբրեւ ընդ պատրուակաւ մուծին զաշխարհի միտս Եւտիքի հերձուածոցն. եւ բազումք թէպէտ եւ ոչ գիտեն զմայր հերցուածոյդ, այլ ունին ի սովորութենէ իբրեւ դուքդ՝ պարտ է ձեզ լսել աշխատասիրաց յորժամ ծանուցին, եթէ հերձուածողական միտք բանիդ, եւ ոչ ի գրոց սրբոց: Այլ եւ ձեզ պարտ է գրել, եթէ յետ ծանուցելոյն, որք ի միմին կայցեն, եւ ընդ նոցին հաղորդիցին, որ գիտակաւ զհերձուածն ունիցին՝ ոչ իբրեւ տգիտաց ներէ Աստուած յաւուրն յանդիմանութեան, այլ ընդ հերձուածողօքն եւ ընդ հակառակորդօքն դատի զնոցունց ձայնակիցսն:

15. Այլ պարտ է ձեզ լսել Պաղոսի, որ ասեն, եւ զնոյն ձայն փառաբանել, եթէ «Ոչինչ եղի ի մտի գիտել ձեզ, բայց միայն զՅիսուս Քրիստոս եւ զնոյն ի խաչ ելեալ». եւ դարձեալ, եթէ «Յիսուս Քրիստոս գրեցաւ ի խաչ ելանել»: Չոյն եւ երանելի առաքեալն Պետրոս ասէ, եթէ «Քրիստոսի չարչարելն<sup>b</sup> մարմնով՝ վասն մեր». «Թէպէտ եւ մեռաւ մարմնով՝ կենդանի է հոգով»: Եւ սուրբ աւետարանն ասէ. «ԶՅիսուս խնդրէք՝ զՆազօրեցի զխաչելեալն<sup>c</sup>», եւ ոչ որ ասաց զանմահ հոգին չարչարեալ եւ մեռեալ, այլ «զՆազովրեցին»<sup>d</sup>, զոր ի մէնջն էառ եւ ընդ իւր միաւորեաց անբաժանելի. եւ ամենայն պատուիրանքս այսմ վկայեն<sup>e</sup>, եթէ Քրիստոս մարմնով իրով չարչարեցաւ եւ մեռաւ, եւ<sup>f</sup> ոչ որ զանմահ հոգին ասաց չարչարեալ եւ մեռեալ Մանիքէաբար: Քանզի բազում ի միտս արկանէ հերձուածոյ աւելադրութիւն բանիդ. բայց [434r] ձեզ պարտ է զսրբոյ աւետարանին զհետ երթալ եւ մի յաջ եւ մի յահեակ խոտորել, եւ ոչ գրոյս մերում կարաւտանալ. զի ի ճշմարիտ ի հաւատս ոչ բռնութեամբ ինչ վայել է ածել, այլ կամօք խնդրել վասն երկեղի գեղենին: Զի ահա եւ ի մերում քաղաքիս գտանին հրէայք եւ հեթանոսք, եւ քանզի զլոյս

“Trisagion,”<sup>89</sup> as if introducing in a veiled manner the heresies of Eutyches to the world. Although many are unfamiliar with the mother of this heresy, but like you cherish it customarily, [they] as well as you ought to listen to those who have studied [the matter] when they make it known: that the thought is of heretical reasoning and not from the Holy Scriptures. Now that you are informed, you ought to write to those who are in that position and to those who commune with them, that on the day of reckoning God will not forgive those who hold on to heresy knowingly as being ignorant, but will judge with the heretics and with the opponents [of Christ] those acting in concert with them.

15. You ought to listen to Paul and to give praise for what he says: *For I intended to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified* (1 Corinthians 2:2). And again: *Jesus Christ was portrayed as crucified* (Galatians 3:1). The blessed Apostle Peter says the same: *Since Christ suffered in (his) body for our sake* (1 Peter 4:1), *Although he died in the body, he is alive in the Spirit* (1 Peter 3:18). And the holy Gospel says: *You are seeking Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified* (Mark 16:6). No one says the immortal spirit suffered and died, but “the Nazarene” who was received by us and united inseparably [our humanity] to his [Divinity]. All the commandments attest to this, that Christ suffered and died in his body. No one says, like the Manichaeans, that the immortal soul suffered and died. Your reasoning brings to mind many of the addenda by the heretics. But you ought to follow the holy Gospel, without straying to the right or the left. Do not even look attentively at our writing, for the true faith should not be imposed forcibly, but be sought willingly for fear of hell. Here in our city are Jews and pagans.<sup>90</sup>

a Երրորդութեանն] Երրորդութեան

b չարչարելն] չարչարիւն

c զՆազօրեցի զխաչելեալն] զՆազովրեցի զխաչեցեալն

d զՆազօրացին] զՆազովրեցին

e վկայեն] վկայեցին

f մեռաւ եւ] մեռան

89 Lit., “into that of the Holy Trinity.” Referring to Peter II Gnapheus (the “Fuller”), for whom see n. 47. Cf. §§2 and 16.

90 Pagan presence in Jerusalem must have continued since Hadrian’s building of Aelia Capitolina after the Second Jewish Revolt (132–35 CE). Jewish presence in Jerusalem, banned since Hadrian, was temporary during the failed attempt of Julian the Apostate (r. 361–363) to rebuild the Temple (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 9), but took a lasting turn during the changing conditions when Empress Eudokia (d. 460) settled there in 443, after separating from Emperor Theodosius II (r. 408–450). She protected both minorities; K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women*

տեսանեն եւ խարխափեն<sup>a</sup> մեք ոչինչ բռնութիւն առնենք չկամողացն ի վերա<sup>b</sup>, զի ար Է, որ խնդրէ եւ դատի:

16. Բայց վասն Զո Երանութեանդ լուաք, եթէ կամակից եւ բարոյ եւ ընկալար թուղթս երկուս ի Մակարայ եւ Եւստոքայ՝ ի ձեռն բարեպաշտի եւ աշխատասիրի Թումասու, որ ոչինչ պէտս ունի ի ձէնջ պատուի եւ մեծութեան, բայց միայն ոգոց ձերոց փրկութեան. Վասն որոյ եւ զիս թախանձեաց գրել ըստ օրինակի նոցա, որ յառաջ քան զմեզ էին նախընկալք աթոռոյն Յակոբայ առաքելոյ, եւ ես ինչ ոչ յապաղեցի ծանուցանել զբարեպաշտութիւն կամողացող բարեպաշտութեան: Ոչ միայն զմերս առաքեցաք, այլ եւ զպատճառս չորից ուղղափառ ժողովոցն գրել հրամայեցաք, զի գիտիցէք, եթէ վասն որոյ հերձուածոց ժողովեցան եւ զինչ սահմանեցին, եւ վասն յաւելադրութեան Անտիոքացոյն հրամայեցաք գրել զերանելեաց չորից հայրապետացն՝ զՀռոմայն եւ զայլոց ուղղափառ եպիսկոպոսաց, որ զԱնտիոքացոյն չարափառութիւնսն յանդիմանեցին գրոց վկայութեամբ: Եւ վասն Յովհաննոսի Աղիկառնասացոյ հերձուածոյն,

a խարխափեն] խարխափին

b վերա] վերայ

They see the light and are taken aback. We do not impose anything on those who are not willing, for there is a day of reckoning and judgment.

16. But we have heard about Your Beatitude that you long for what is good and that you received two letters, from Macarius and Eustochius,<sup>91</sup> sent with the pious and diligent T'umas, who wishes neither honor nor respect from you, save the salvation of your soul. He thus entreated me to write, following the example of those who held the See of the Apostle James before us. And we did not hesitate to make piety known to those who long for piety. We are not only dispatching our [letter], but we also ordered [for you the copying of] the written account of the causes for the Four Orthodox Councils, that you may know the heresies because of which they were convened and what they decreed. Because of the addition by the Antiochene,<sup>92</sup> we ordered the copying of the writings in which the four blessed patriarchs, that of Rome and the other orthodox bishops, condemned with scriptural proof the impiety of the

and *Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 3 (Berkeley, 1982), 118.

91 The two immediate predecessors of John IV: Macarius II (in office 552, 564–575) and Eustochius (in office 552–563/4). N. Akinian wrongly ascribes to this Macarius an earlier “Letter to the Armenians” belonging to Macarius I (in office 314–335/6): *T’ult’ Makaray B. Erusalēmi Hayrapeti ar Vrt’anēs Episkoposapet Siwneac’ yalags kargac’ ekelec’woy* (The Letter of Macarius II, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Vrt’anēs, Chief-Bishop of Siwnik’, on the Ordinances of the Church), Azgayin Matenadaran 128 (Vienna, 1930; repr. in *Handēs Amsōrya* 44 [1930]: 509–78, 631–35). See the objections to Akinian’s fabricated arguments in Terian, *Macarius of Jerusalem* (see n. 24), 21, 29–40. As a contemporary “Priester der Mechitharistenkongregation” to which Akinian belonged, Vardanian follows the latter uncritically, perhaps out of fraternal loyalty; see “Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief,” 75 n. 2, thus contradicting the very Greek sources he cites at the beginning, p. 64 n. 2. For an accurate reading of the patriarchal line indicated here, see T. Greenwood, “‘New Light from the East’: Chronography and Ecclesiastical History through a Late Seventh-Century Armenian Source,” *JChSt* 16 (2008): 197–254, at 241; cf. Terian, *Macarius of Jerusalem*, 155–62. For the succession of the Jerusalem patriarchs in this period, see Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.37, 39; 5.16; trans. Whitby, *Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, 242, 250, 277.

92 As elsewhere, referring to Patriarch Peter II of Antioch and his addition to the *trisagion* (cf. §§2 and 14).

որ զմարմինն Քրիստոսի օտարացոյց ի մերմէ բնութենէն եւ անապականացու [434v] անուանեաց մինչեւ ցխաչելութիւնն՝ եւ վասն այսր հերձուածոյ հրամայեցաք զրել զերանելեաց եպիսկոպոսացն՝ զՆոմայն եւ զԱնտիոքայն<sup>a</sup> զարքեպիսկոպոսացն: Ընդ նոսին եւ զԹուղթսն Կիրողի արքեպիսկոպոսին, որ զՆեստորի չարափառութիւնն յանդիմանեաց: Զայս ամենայն թարգմանել եւ գրել հրամայեցաք աշխատասիրի Թումասու քահանայի եւ առաքել Քում Բարեպաշտութեանդ. զի ոչ միայն իմով գրով, այլ քան զմեզ լաւագունից թղթովք ուսուցանիցես զեպիսկոպոսակիցս Քո, որ դիպող եւ ճշմարիտ վկայութեամբ են հաստատեալ ի սուրբ աւետարանէն եւ յառաքելոյն թուղթ նոցա, եթէ ոք կամիցի երկեղիւն Աստուծոյ ընդունել: Բայց միայն դու մի թաքուցաներ<sup>b</sup> եւ նենգեր զճշմարիտ վարդապետութիւն եկեղեցոյ:

17. Բազում կցորդք են խաչելութեանն Քրիստոսի, որպէս կամին ասել ԶՔրիստոս խաչեալ, բայց ի սուրբ Երրորդութեանն կարգ. ո՛չ Քրիստոսի երթայ «խաչեցելոյն», այլ անմարմին<sup>c</sup> եւ անմահ հոգւոյն ասեն<sup>d</sup> չարչարեալ եւ մեռեալ, եւ ապա սուտ պատճառեն, եթէ «Մեք զԵրեսեանն Որդւոյ ասենք»: Նրեշտակին բարբառն հաւատարիմ է եւ

Antiochene.<sup>93</sup> And because of the heresy of Julian of Halicarnassus,<sup>94</sup> who distanced the body of Christ from our nature and deemed it incorruptible until the Crucifixion, primarily because of this heresy, we ordered the copying of those by the Roman and Antiochene archbishops,<sup>95</sup> and along with these, the “Letters” of Archbishop Cyril who condemned the abomination of Nestorius.<sup>96</sup> We ordered to have all these copied and translated by the diligent priest T‘umas and sent to your piety, so that you may instruct your bishops not just with my writing but with those superior epistles, which are affirmed by the proper and true witness of the holy Gospel and the Apostles’ Epistles, which one ought to receive with fear of God. But as for you, do not conceal or mask the true teaching of the Church.

17. Many are the hymns on Christ’s Crucifixion, intended to point to the crucified Christ. But the sequence [of the “Trisagion”] pertains to the Holy Trinity.<sup>97</sup> [Consequently, the addition] “Who was crucified” is not limited to Christ; they say it about the bodiless and immortal Spirit, having suffered and died. And then they argue falsely, “we address the

- a զԱնտիոքայն] Անտիոքայն
- b թաքուցաներ] թագուցաներ
- c անմարմին] անմարմինն
- d ասեն] ասելն

93 In 485 Peter was condemned and anathematized by a synod of Western bishops at Rome, and excommunicated (though he remained in office). This was during the pontificate of (St.) Felix III (in office 483–492) who must be the “patriarch of Rome” alluded to here, known also for his repudiation of the *Henōtikon* issued by Emperor Zeno in 482. The identity of the “other orthodox bishops” could not be ascertained from the document.

94 See §§2, 10–11.

95 It is not clear which Antiochene archbishop is meant; possibly Patriarch John I (in office 429–441), who at Ephesus urged Nestorius to accept the use of the word *Theotokos*. Cf. the *Formula of Reunion*, a theological statement devised as a compromise, on the basis of which Cyril of Alexandria (see the following note) and John of Antioch were reconciled in 433. The “Roman” is a likely allusion to Pope Leo I (in office 440–461), author of the *Tome*, a decisive document during the debates at Chalcedon.

96 Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) was a central figure at the Council of Ephesus (431) which deposed Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople from 428. Of special note are Cyril’s second and third “Epistles” to Nestorius (the latter containing the Twelve Anathemas), and more so his five tomes *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias*.

97 Namely, ἄγιος ὁ Θεός (the Father), ἄγιος ἰσχυρός (the Son), ἄγιος ἀθάνατος (the Spirit); cf. Vardanian, “Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief,” 76 n. 2.

հարցն առաջնոց եւ չորից ուղղափառ ժողովոցն, որ զ«սուրբ Աստուած»՝ զՀայր ասացին, «սուրբ հօր»՝ զՈրդի, եւ «սուրբ անմահ»՝ զՀոգին սուրբ: Այլ եւ ի սուրբ անտարանին զնոյն գտանէք, եթէ «Երթայք մկրտեցէք զաշխարհ յանուն Հօր, եւ ապա Որդոյ եւ ապա Հոգւոյն սրբոյ»: Եւ արդ՝ յերիս ձայնսդ մի՛ ինչ յաւելու<sup>a</sup>, մի՛ մարմին, մի՛ հոգի, մի՛ խաչ, եւ մի՛ չարչարանս, զի այտ<sup>b</sup> փառատրութիւն սրոբէից<sup>c</sup> է՝ յառաջ քան զմարդանալ Որդոյն Աստուծոյ է, որպէս ուսաք յետայեայ Մարգարէէ: [435r] Իսկ ուր Որդի միայն փառաբանի՝ անդ որպէս կամիս, յիշեալ<sup>d</sup> զմարմնանալն, զխաչելն<sup>e</sup>, զչարչարելն<sup>f</sup> եւ դի՛ր զխաչն անուան Տեառն մերոյ Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի Որդոյն Աստուծոյ, որ խաչեցան եւ չարչարեցան եւ թաղեցաւ<sup>g</sup> եւ յարուցեալ վերացաւ՝ անբաժանելի ի Հայրէ: Ապա եթէ յանկարծակի հակառակութիւն եւ վիճաբանութիւն<sup>h</sup> որ ի ներքս բերէ՝ յայնպիսեացն յետ մի անգամ եւ երկիցս խրատելոյ, հրաժարեալ<sup>i</sup>, զի թիւրեալ է, զի զանձնիշխանութիւն մարդոյ, ի բարի կամ ի չար՝ Աստուած ոչ բռնադատեաց. եւ ոչ որ ի հոգելից մարգարէից կամ յառաքելոց, քանզի ասէ. «Բարձի թողի զնոսա երթալ զիստ կամաց սրտից իւրեանց», եւ ապա «Գան առ իս եւ ես դատեմ զնոսա»: Նոյնպէս եւ մեք ի մերում քաղաքիս զկամօղոսն բարեպաշտութեան ոչ բռնադատեմք, այլ միայն զսպասատրոսն եկեղեցոյ զբարեպաշտոն կարգաւորեմք: Զսոյն եւ Երանութեանդ Քուս պարտ է առնել, եւ որ ոչն կամին զլոյսն բարեպաշտութեան՝ երթիցեն ի խաւարն հերձուածողաց:

18. Բայց լուաք, թէ ոմանք յիշխանութենէդ Քուսմէ՝ բարեպաշտից նեղութիւն եւ հալածանս հասուցանեն. այդ անօրէնութիւն հեթանոսացն թագաւորաց է, որ Քրիստոսի խոստովանողացն զոհել հարկեցուցանէին. եւ դուք լսէք եւ ներէ՛ք

‘Tris(agion)’ to the Son.” Faithful is the message of the early Fathers and of the Four Orthodox Councils, that “Holy God” is said regarding the Father; “Holy Mighty” regarding the Son; “Holy Immortal” regarding the Holy Spirit. Moreover, you find the same in the Holy Gospel: *Go baptize the world in the name of the Father, then of the Son, and then of the Holy Spirit*.<sup>98</sup> Whereas the addition to the “Tris(agion)” hymn [reduces] to one body, one spirit, one cross, and one suffering the very seraphic praise that existed before the Incarnation of God’s Son, as we learn from the Prophet Isaiah.<sup>99</sup> But where the Son alone is praised, there, as you wish, make mention of the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Passion, and append the Cross to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, God’s Son, who was crucified and suffered and was buried, and was raised without being separated from the Father. And should someone unexpectedly introduce an objection or controversy, warn such a person once or twice, then abstain, for he is perverse; since man’s sovereign will [is inclined] for either good or evil. God does not compel, nor do any of the inspired Prophets and Apostles. For [scripture] says: *I gave them over to follow the will of their hearts* (Psalms 81:12 [80:13 LXX]); and again: *They will come to me and I will judge them* (2 Samuel 15:4 [2 Kingdoms 15:4 LXX]).<sup>100</sup> Similarly with us, in our city we do not condemn those who do not wish to pursue piety; we only regulate the pious servants of the church. Your Beatitude should do the same; and those who do not wish for the light of piety shall move out into the darkness of the heretics.

18. However, we have heard that some under your jurisdiction are causing trouble for pious believers, even persecution. Such lawlessness belongs to pagan kings,<sup>101</sup> those who compelled confessors of Christ to offer sacrifices. And do you tolerate and

a յաւելուլ յաւելլով

b այտ corr. այդլ այդ

c սրոբէիցլ սրովբէիցն

d յիշեայլ յիշեա

e զխաչելն զխաչիւն

f զչարչարելն զչարչարիւն

g թաղեցալ թաղեցան

h եւ վիճաբանութիւն om.

i հրաժարեայլ հրաժարեա

98 Referring to Matt 28:19.

99 Alluding to Isa 6:3.

100 These, however, are the words of Absalom (ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἐλεύσεται πᾶς ἀνὴρ . . . καὶ δικαίωσω αὐτόν). Cf. Ezek 24:14 LXX: *According to your ways and according to your notions I will judge you* (κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς σου καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐνθυμήματά σου κρινῶ σε).

101 Possibly echoing Matt 20:25–26a, considered abominable in the *ecclesia*.



այդպիսի անօրէնութեան եւ լինի՞ք հաղորդք նոցա անօրէնութեանց, որ քա՛ւ եւ մի՛ լիցի. այլ մեծաւ սրտմտութեամբ սաստել այնպիսեացն, զի դադարեցեն<sup>a</sup> յանպիսի անօրէնութենէ, զի ոչ են այնպիսիքն տեսուչք եկեղեցոյ, այլ գայլք ապականիչք: Եւ Բարեպաշտութեանդ Քում ոչ է [435v] պարտ տալ ձեռնադրութիւն առանց մեծի քննութեան, քանզի ուսաք, եթէ միտս ունիս եւ գիտութիւն եւ պատիւ եւ սէր եւ սաստ ի թագաւորաց, եւ կարող եւ ամենայնիւ ըմբերանել որ ի քէն ձեռնադրեցան՝ եւ անողղայս գնայցեն, եւ ոչ ըստ պատուիրանի սրբոց առաքելոց եւ աւետարանչաց եւ չորից ուղղափառ ժողովոցն, որոց ճշմարիտ հաւատովք լուսաւորեալ պայծառանա՞<sup>b</sup> Կաթողիկէ Եկեղեցի: Բայց այլոց աշխարհականաց տգիտաց պարտ է մեղմով վկայել եւ զբարեպաշտութիւն ծանուցանել, զի մի ասիցեն յաւոր յանդիմանութեան, թէ «Չգիտէաք եւ չուուցիք». եւ ապա յետ վկայելոյ՝ ի կանս անձին իւրոյ թողուլ ըստ գրեցելումն, զի առանց պատասխանատուութեան դատեսցին յարդար Դատաւորէն:

19. Ձայս ամենայն ոչ եթէ՞<sup>c</sup> ուսուցանել, այլ յիշեցուցանել Գիտութեանդ Քում կամեցայ. Ողջ լեր Տերամբ, Բարեպաշտօնակից մեր, եւ մեք ողջ եմք յողորմութենէն Աստուծոյ:

allow such lawlessness, working in partnership with their lawlessness? God forbid! Rather, with much sorrow [you should] scold such people, that they may cease from such lawlessness. Their kind does not qualify to be overseers of the Church, for they are wolves that corrupt. Your Piety should not ordain [any] without intense examination. For we have learned that you are perceptive, knowledgeable, and respected; honored, loved, and commended by kings; and are capable of fully controlling those ordained by you, those who go on senselessly and not in keeping with the injunctions of the holy Apostles, the Gospels, and the Four Orthodox Councils, in whose true faith the enlightened catholic Church flourishes. As for the secular, ignorant people, they should be kindly witnessed to and informed about piety. So that on the day of reckoning they will not say, “We did not know and you did not teach.” Beyond witnessing, I leave it to his will, in accordance with the Scriptures, lest there be charges of irresponsibility by the just Judge.

19. I have not intended to teach but to remind all these things to Your Wisdom. Be well in the Lord, O our pious coworker.<sup>102</sup> As for us, we are well by God’s mercy.

a դադարեցեն] դադարեսցին

b պայծառանա] պայծառանայ

c եթէ] թէ

102 Cf. the conventional formula of salutation in the Letter opening.

## Addendum

*Թողթ զոր Տէր Յովհաննէս Հայոց Կաթողիկոս եւ այլ եպիսկոպոսոնք առ Աղուանից եպիսկոպոսունս արարին<sup>a</sup>*

Ի. Լաւաց, ճշմարտից եւ աստուածասիրաց, սիրելի եղբարց եւ արծառակցած մերոց, Աբասու Պարտաւայ եպիսկոպոսի, Մովսէսի Բաղադատու եպիսկոպոսի, Գրիգորի Կապադակայ եպիսկոպոսի, Հռոմակայ Ամարասայ եպիսկոպոսի, Տիմոթէի Բաղասականու եպիսկոպոսի, Ամբակունայ Շաքիոյ եպիսկոպոսի, Յովհաննէս Գարդմանայ եպիսկոպոսի, Ղեւոնդի Մեծկողմանց եպիսկոպոսի, ի Յովհաննիսէ Հայոց կաթողիկոսէ, յԱբրահամայ Տարանոյ եւ Մամիկոնէից եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Գրիգորէ Մարդպետական եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Ներսայ<sup>b</sup> Բասենոյ եւ Մարդաղոյ եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Ստեփանոսէ Տայոց եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Մաշտոցէ Խոռխոռունեաց եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Գիւտայ Վանանդայ եպիսկոպոսէ, յԱրքիշոյէ Ասորեաց ուղղափառաց եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Քրիստափորէ Ռշտունեաց եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Բաբայ Ամատունեաց եպիսկոպոսէ, ի Սեկունդոսէ Մոկկայ եպիսկոպոսէ, եւ յայլ եպիսկոպոսաց աշխարհիս արինոյթեամբ եւ հոգեւոր սիրով ողջոյն:

a The text provided here is that in Polarian, *Girk' t'it'oc'* (see n. 2), 210–14. I have enumerated its sections and indented the confessional lines in §3.

b Ablative of Ներս, diminutive of Ներսի (q.v. in Ačařyan, *Hayoc' anjnanunneri bařaran*, 4:30).

*The letter that Lord Yovhannēs, Catholicos of the Armenians and other bishops, sent to the bishops of the [Caucasian] Albanians.*

1. To our good, true, God-loving and beloved brothers and co-chairs: to Abas, bishop of Partaw;<sup>103</sup> Moses, bishop of Bałalat; Grigor, bishop of Kapalak; Hřomak, bishop of Amaras; Timothy, bishop of Bałasakan; Habakkuk, bishop of Šak'ē; Yohanik, bishop of Gardman; Lewond, bishop of Meckołmank'; from Yovhannēs, catholicos of the Armenians; Abraham, bishop of Tarōn and of the Mamikoneans; Grigor, bishop of Mardpetakan; Ners, bishop of Basean and Mardali; Step'anos, bishop of Tayk'; Maštoc', bishop of Xořxořunik'; Giwt, bishop of Vanand; Abdišoy [Abdisho], bishop of the orthodox Syrians; K'ristap'or, bishop of Řtunik; Bab, bishop of Amatunik'; Secundos, bishop of Mokk'; and the other bishops of our country; with blessing, and greeting with spiritual love.<sup>104</sup>

103 The primacy of Abas is significant, even though he is not addressed as catholicos in this letter dated to before 572 CE. However, in the version redacted by the author of *The History of the Caucasian Albanians*, he is addressed as “Lord Abas catholicos of (Caucasian) Albania” (trans. Dowsett, 72).

104 It is beyond the scope of this study to elaborate on the toponymy and ethnonymy of the first paragraph; the boundaries of certain of the named districts remain uncertain. It should be sufficient to draw attention to Dowsett's “Index of Geographical and Ethnic Terms” appended to his translation (pp. 241–46). The same holds true for prosopography, in that most of the bishops named are unattested elsewhere (“Index of Personal Names,” in *ibid.*, 233–40). To the extent possible, more may be gathered from R. H. Hewsen, *The Geography of Ananias of Širak (Ašxarhac'oyc'): The Long and the Short Recensions. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B-77 (Wiesbaden, 1992), and from H. Ačařyan, *Hayoc' anjnanunneri bařaran* (Dictionary of Armenian Personal Names), 5 vols. (Erevan, 1942–62). The Syrian bishop Abdisho stands out as the non-Armenian exception among the eleven signatories of the letter. His overbearing role in the controversies of the time is borne also by the Letter of John IV of Jerusalem to Abas (§§2, 12, and n. 19) and has a history going back to the First Council of Dwin (505/6 CE).

2. Քանզի եհաս առ մեզ լուր դժնդակ համբաւոյ, եթէ են ոմանք գայլք յափշտակողք զգեստոք ոչխարաց, որք եկին յաշխարհոյ ձեր ի վանաց պղծոյն Պետրոսի, որ անուամբ աղքատասէրք կոչին եւ գործովք՝ քրիստոսատեացք եւ ուրացողք զսուրբ Երրորդութիւնն, զչար որոմն անիծելոյն Նեստորի եւ զժողովոյն Քաղկեդոնի անարգելաբար սերմանեն ի հոգիս անմեղաց, թիրելով զնոսա յուղղափառ հաւատոյ՝ մատնել ի յափտենական կորուստն: Զորմէ լսելով առհասարակ ոգւոյ եւ մարմնոյ եղեն անբժշկելի ցաւք: Վասնորոյ ամենայն հարկատրութեամբ փոքացաք կարեկից լինել ձեզ եւ գրել, յիշեցուցանելով զբանս սրբոյ առաքելոյն. Զգուշանալ անձանց եւ ամենայն հատիդ, յորում եղ զձեզ սուրբ Հոգին տեսուչս եւ վարդապետս՝ հաստատուն պահել զհաւատս ուղղափառութեան, զոր ընկալան հարքն մեր ի սրբոց գրոց, ի Հին եւ ի Նոր Կտակարանաց, ի ձեռն սրբոյն Գրիգորի, եւ յերից երանելեաց ժողովոցն, ՅԺԸիցն ի Նիկիա, ՃԾիցն ի Կոստանդնուպոլիս, եւ Միցն յԵփեսոս, որոց ձայնակիցք, եւ ժառանգաւորք ուղղափառ հաւատոյն նոցա եղաք մեք ամենայն եկեղեցիք:

3. Խոստովանիմք մեք զմի Աստուած Հայր ամենակալ, զարարողն ամենայն երեւելեաց եւ աներեւելեաց, եւ ի մի Տէր Յիսուս Քրիստոս, յորդին Աստուծոյ, ծնեալ ի Հայրէ, Աստուած յԱստուծոյ, լոյս ի լուսոյ, Աստուած ճշմարիտ յԱստուծոյ ճշմարտէ, որով ամենայնքն: Եւ ի

2. We have received disconcerting news, that there are *rapacious wolves in sheep's clothing* (Matthew 7:15), who have come into your country from the monastery of the defiled Peter, who go by the name of “lovers of the poor”<sup>105</sup> yet by their deeds they are haters of Christ and deniers of the Holy Trinity. Unhindered, they sow the evil weed<sup>106</sup> of the accursed Nestorius and of the Council of Chalcedon in innocent souls,<sup>107</sup> leading them astray from the orthodox faith into eternal damnation. Just hearing of this, we are having incurable pains of soul and body, all over. For this reason we have hastened to inform you in writing, reminding of the word by the holy Apostle: *To guard your soul and your whole flock, over which the Holy Spirit has appointed you overseers* (Acts 20:28) and teachers; to keep the orthodox faith unshaken, which our fathers received from the holy Scriptures, both from the Old and the New Testaments at the hand of Saint Gregory and the three blessed councils: of the 318 in Nicaea, the 150 in Constantinople, and of the 200 in Ephesus, of whose orthodox faith all our churches have become confessors and heirs.

3. We confess one God: Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, born of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, through whom are all things;<sup>108</sup>

105 The Arm. compound *alk'atasērk'* translates Gk. φιλόπτωχοι, a rare word encountered in interpretations of the “Beatitudes” (in commendations of “the poor in spirit”; Matt 5:3). There is good reason, however, to think of the Arm. word as equivalent also to “Ebionites” or “the poor ones,” who thrived in Syria and Mesopotamia and who—or their factions—appear among heretics listed in the *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403). As Jewish Christians, they were known as forerunners of those who reject the divinity of Christ and his virgin birth.

106 Allusion to “The Parable of the Weeds”; Matt 13:24–30.

107 On the conflated distinction between Nestorian and Chalcedonian doctrines, see Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, 260–261.

108 These opening lines follow the first half of the Nicene Creed, substituting *ὁμολογούμεν* for *πιστεύομεν*, omitting *οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς* in the statement on the Father, and *γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ* and the rest: *τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* in the statement on the Son. Cf. Kinzig, *Faith in Formulae* (see n. 86), 1:290 (§135). Curiously, the last line of this confessional section reverts to the Nicene Creed. For comparison with other Armenian Church

սուրբ Հոգին, որ ի Հարէ ելանէ, եւ ընդ Հար եւ ընդ Որդոյ երկրպագի եւ փառաբանի, արարչակից եւ հաւասար Հար եւ Որդոյ, Երրորդութիւն կատարեալ միով բնութեամբ, փառաւք եւ զարութեամբ եւ իշխանութեամբ՝ նախախնամելով զընդհանուր եղեալքս:

Իսկ ի վախճան ժամանակիս Աստուած գոլով մշտնջենաւոր Բանն Աստուծոյ եղեւ մարդ կատարեալ անյեղապէս, մարմնացեալ ի սուրբ կուսէն անձառաքար, եւ ոչ հեռացեալ ի բնութենէն, եւ ոչ քայքայեալ ի մարմնատրոփիւն, այլ եկաց մնաց նոյն որ էրն, անփոփոխելի եւ անայլալելի, Աստուած մարմնացեալ, ոչ մասամբ այլ բոլորովիմբ, ոչ պակասութեամբ այլ լիութեամբ, ոչ երկոսութիւն այլ միութիւն անբաժանելի: Ոչ Հայր էառ մարմին այլ Որդի եւ ոչ սուրբ Հոգին թանձրացեալ մարմնով այլ Միածինն ի Հարէ, բայց կամաւք Հար եւ զարութեամբ սուրբ Հոգոյն, այլ գոյութեամբ միայն Բանն Աստուծոյ:

Այսպէս եւ սուրբ ծնունդն ճանաչի: Նոյն ինքն անբովանդակելի խանձարապատեցաւ, զի մեք զգեցցուք զանապականութիւն. եղաւ ի մտոր, զի զանասնականն ի բաց փոխեցուք զբարս, ի հրեշտակաց փառաբանեցաւ, զի մեք կոչեցուք լինել փառաբանակիցք նոցա, ընծայեցաւ ի մոգուցն, զի պողաբերեցուք զհաւատս, կաթնաբուծեցաւ զի զանմեղութիւն ընկալցուք, զարգացաւ ըստ մարմնոյ ամենակատարն, զի ժամանեցուք ի չափ հասակի լրմանն կատարմանն Զրիստոսի: Եկն կամաւ ի չարչարանս, զի ի տանջանաց մեղացն զերցուցէ: Խաչեցաւ զի ի կենդանութեան պտղոյն վայելեցուք: Մեռաւ զի մահուամբ մեռուցէ զմահ:

and in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and is worshipped and praised with the Father and the Son, co-creator with and equal to the Father and the Son; perfect Trinity with one nature, glory and power and rulership, sustaining providentially all created beings.

In these end times,<sup>109</sup> though being God, the eternal Word of God became a perfect man<sup>110</sup> — without flaw,<sup>111</sup> taking body from the blessed Virgin ineffably,<sup>112</sup> neither separating [himself] from [his] nature nor being diminished in embodiment, but remaining the same as he was, unchangeable and unalterable; God incarnate, not in part but wholly, not wanting but fully, not in duality but in indivisible union. Not that the Father took body but the Son, nor that the Holy Spirit congealed bodily but the Only-begotten from the Father,<sup>113</sup> yet by the will of the Father and the power of the Holy Spirit, none other but the Word of God in essence.<sup>114</sup>

So too is the Holy Nativity understood: The very one who cannot be contained was wrapped in clothes so that we may be clothed in incorruption. He was placed in a manger so that those of animal nature may be transformed. He was glorified by angels so that we may be called co-glorifiers with them. He received gifts from the magi so that we may prosper in faith. He was fed at the breast so that we may obtain innocence. The most perfect one grew up bodily so that we may attain the fullness of Christ's perfection. He came willingly to suffer so that he may deliver from tortures because of sin. He was crucified so that we may enjoy the fruit of life. He died in order to destroy death. He was laid

confessional statements by predecessors of the catholicos, see Frivold, *Incarnation* (see n. 2), 185–88.

109 Echoing Heb 1:2.

110 Echoing John 1:1, 18; Col 2:9.

111 Echoing Heb 4:15.

112 Echoing Luke 2:7; Gal 4:4.

113 Echoing John 1:18; 3:16.

114 The rest has homiletic overtones, based on the primitive church's *kerygma* with familiar biblical allusions.



Եղաւ ի գերեզմանի, զի խորտակեցէ զնիզս դժոխց: Յերրորդ ատուր յարեաւ, զի զմեզ ի նորոգութիւն կենդանութեան փոխեցէ: Տամբարձաւ յերկինս եւ նստաւ ընդ աջմէ՝ Հայր, զի եւ մեք դասեալ լիցուք ընդ աջմէ նորա:

Գալոց է միւսանգամ դատել զկենդանիս եւ զմեռեալս, եւ թագաւորութիւն նորա վախճան ոչ ունի:

4. Այսպէս հաաստամք եւ երկրպագենք եւ փառաբանելով ասենք «Սուրբ Աստուած, սուրբ եւ հզար, սուրբ եւ անմահ որ խաչեցար վասն մեր ողորմեա մեզ»: Իսկ զոչ այսպէս խոստովանողսն նզովեցին սուրբ հարքն, նմանապէս եւ մեք նզովենք զհինս զամենեսեան եղեալ հերձուածողսն եւ զնորս, զԱրիոս, զՊաւղոս Սամոստացի, զՄանի եւ զՄարկիոն, զԵւնոմիոս, եւ զԷտիքոս, զԱպաւղինարոս, եւ զպեղծն Նեստոր, եւ զԹէոդորիտոս, եւ զանոտի ժողովն Քաղկեդոնի, եւ զտումարն Լեւոնի, որ լրբաբար յանդգնեցան ասել երկուս բնութիւնս եւ երկուս դէմն ի վերայ միոյ Բրիստոսի Աստուծոյ եւ թէ սուրբ կոյսն ոչ ծնաւ Աստուած, այլ մարդ սոսկ ըստ մեզ եւ տաճար բանին Աստուծոյ:

5. Այլ են ոմանք որ ասեն թէ մինչ յերկրի էր Բրիստոս՝ ոչ էր յերկինս, եւ մինչ ի խաչին վերայ էր՝ ոչ էր յաթոռ փառաց, եւ մինչ ի գերեզմանին էր՝ ոչ էր ընդ աջմէ՝ Հայր: Զխորհեցողսն այսպէս՝ նզովենք:

in the tomb in order to destroy the bolts of hell. He was raised on the third day in order to transform us into the newness of life. He ascended into heaven and sat at the right hand of the Father in order that we may be assigned to his right hand.

He is coming again to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom has no end.<sup>115</sup>

4. We so believe and worship and recite in praising, “Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal, [You] who were crucified for our sake, have mercy on us.”<sup>116</sup> And the holy fathers anathematize those who do not confess in this manner. Likewise we anathematize all the former and recent heretics: Arius, Paul of Samosata, Mani and Marcion, Eunomios and Eutychos, Apollinaris and the defiled Nestorios, and Theodoritos,<sup>117</sup> and the vain Council of Chalcedon, and the Tome of Leo, who dared to say profanely that there are two natures and two *prosopa* in one Christ God, and that the Holy Virgin did not give birth to God but just to a man like us and a temple for God’s Word.

5. And there are those who say that when Christ was on earth he was not in heaven, and when he was on the cross he was not on the throne of glory, and when he was in the tomb he was not at the right hand of the Father.<sup>118</sup> We anathematize those who think so.

115 Reverting to the Nicene [καὶ] πάλιν ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος, omitting μετὰ δόξης after ἐρχόμενον.

116 On questions surrounding the *trisagion* hymn in non-Chalcedonian usage, see the Letter of John IV (§§14, 17).

117 Theodoret of Cyrrhus, considered the architect of the Council of Chalcedon in early Armenian sources.

118 Adoptionism in all its forms.

6. Եւ զԻբա, եւ զԱկակ, եւ զԲարծումա ի Մծքնայ, որք հնազանդեցան ժողովոյն Նեստորի, եւ եղեն պատճառք կորստեան բազմաց, եւ զՍեւերիոս եւ զգիրս ապականութեան նորա, այլ եւ զամենեսեան իսկ զայնոսիկ, որ այսմ հաւանին, եւ հնազանդին նոցա ամպարիշտ սպանող վարդապետութեանն՝ նզովեմք:

7. Եւ առաքեցաք առ ձեզ յովսէփ մերմէ՛ զայր հաւատարիմ՝ զՄատթէոս քահանայ, բերել զգրեալսդ մեր առ ձեզ, ընդ նմին յիշեցուցանելով զբանս Յովհաննու աւետարանչի որ ասէ. Եթէ որ եկեսցէ առ ձեզ եւ զվարդապետութիւնս զայս ոչ ունիցի մի՛ ընդունիցիք զնա ի տունս, եւ մի բանիւ ողջոյն ասել նմա: Եւ եթէ որ ասիցէ այնպիսումն ողջոյն հաղորդեսցի եւ չար գործոց նորա զի որ ոչ խոստովանի զՏէր Յիսուս մարմնով եկեալ, նա ինքն իսկ է Նեռնն մոլորեցուցիչ. զայնպիսիսն ի տանց եւ ի սահմանաց ձերոց հալածել եւ զմահաբեր վարդապետութիւն նոցա ամենեւին ոչ առնել արժանի լսելութեան:

8. Արդ, վասնզի հարքն ձեր հաւատակից էին հարանց մերոց, եւ դուք մեզ, հաճոյ թուեցաւ զալ ի ձէնջ այսր եպիսկոպոսաց երից կամ աւելեաց. լսելով ի մէնջ յանդիման զճշմարիտ վարդապետութիւնն, զի մի որ կորիցէ ի հովուաց կամ ի հատից, այլ ի վերայ բարոյ գիտի ձերոյ եղիցի ուրախութիւն հրեշտակաց յերկինս, եւ մեզ յերկրի, ծառայիցս եւ երկրպագուացս Քրիստոսի Աստուծոյ մերոյ:

Ողջ լերոք ի Տէր:

6. We likewise anathematize Ibas and Akak and Barsouma of Nisibis,<sup>119</sup> who adhered to the council of Nestorios and became cause of perdition for many, and Severus and his writing on corruptibility,<sup>120</sup> and all who like them accept the same and adhere to their wicked, lethal teaching.

7. We have sent to you from among our covenanters a faithful man, the priest Matthew, to bring to you what we have written, reminding herewith the saying of John the Evangelist who states: *If anyone comes to you not having this teaching, do not admit him into the house, and do not welcome him with a greeting* (2 John 1:10). Should someone convey such greeting, he shall be an accomplice of that person's evil deeds, *of the one who does not acknowledge that the Lord Jesus has come in the flesh* (1 John 4:2). *Such person is verily the deluding Ner<sup>121</sup> himself* (1 John 2:22). Chase out of your dwellings and boundaries such person and never consider their teaching worth hearing.

8. Now, since your fathers were fellow believers with our fathers, and you with us, we deemed it pleasing to come to you with [the testimony of] three or more bishops,<sup>122</sup> to hear from us regarding the true teaching, lest any be lost from among the shepherds or the flocks. Rather, upon your finding it well, there will be joy for the angels in heaven<sup>123</sup> and for us on earth, we servants and worshipers of Christ our God.

Be well in the Lord.

119 All three were defenders of Nestorius: Ibas (Ḥibā), bishop of Edessa, 435–457; Acacius (Aqāq), bishop of Beroea, 378–437; and Barsouma (Baršaumā), bishop of Nisibis (fl. ca. 440–490).

120 Although Severus was non-Chalcedonian and is listed among the condemned in the Letter of Patriarch John IV (§10), here he is condemned for holding that the body of Christ is corruptible or passible.

121 The name given to the Antichrist in the Arm. Bible (cf. 1 John 2:18; 4:3; and 2 John 1:7), based on earlier identification of Nero as “the man of lawlessness” mentioned in 2 Thess 2:1–12. The earliest association of the Antichrist with Nero is in the apocryphal *Ascension of Isaiah*, a second-century Jewish-Christian text; cf. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on II Thessalonians* 4.

122 The remark on having three or more bishops for the validation of the veracity of content underlines the unquestionable truthfulness of things told in the letter with so many more signatories. Similarly, three or more bishops were required for the consecration of a bishop, in keeping with Canon 1 of the Apostolic Canons.

123 Echoing Luke 15:10.

St. Nersess Armenian Seminary  
486 Bedford Rd.  
Armonk, NY 10504  
terian@stnersess.edu

✂ MY SPECIAL THANKS TO THE LIBRARIANS at the National Humanities Center, Research Triangle Park, NC, for their help during my year as Robert F. and Margaret S. Goheen Fellow at the Center (2018–19), where this article took shape; to the administration of the Matenadaran / Mashtots' Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Erevan, Armenia, for providing a digitized copy of the base text; and to the anonymous reviewers for their substantive input.

